

9952

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 12, 1965

15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which was ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 184

MR. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the substitute bill S. 1564. I ask that it be printed and lie on the table.

This amendment would delete the provisions of the bill that nullify the power of State legislatures to enact voting laws after the bill goes into effect in a State or to enact any voting qualification or procedure different from that in effect on November 1, 1964.

It is a sad commentary on our form of Government to require States to submit new laws duly enacted by their legislatures to the Attorney General for approval before they can go into effect, and it is likewise inconsistent with the powers of the States to require that new State laws be tested by declaratory judgments in the District of Columbia before they can be placed into effect.

The Constitution of the United States would not have been ratified by the States had this provision been in it. It seems to me that it is beyond the power of Congress at the present time to require this indignity of the States.

There is no real need for the provision and it is purely an attempt to punish the Southern States. Under our normal system of law acts of State legislatures can be tested in the courts, and in many cases they can be tested promptly.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILLS

MR. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate bill 1232, the so-called Freedom Academy bill, that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] be added as a cosponsor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MR. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE] be added as cosponsors of S. 1833, a bill to establish the Pacific Medical Center.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AID TO ECONOMICALLY DISTRESSED AREAS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 4, 1965, the names of Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. BASS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CLARK, Mr. GORE, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of New York, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. PELL, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of

Ohio were added as additional cosponsors of amendment No. 143, intended to be proposed by Mr. RANDOLPH, to the bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions, submitted by Mr. RANDOLPH on May 4, 1965.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON AMENDMENT TO EXPORT CONTROL ACT OF 1949

MR. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I announce that the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency will begin hearings on Monday, May 24, 1965, on the bill, S. 948, to amend section 2 of the Export Control Act of 1949. The hearings will be held at 10 a.m., in room 5302, New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wish to appear and testify in connection with this bill are requested to notify Matthew Hale, chief of staff, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-3921.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, NOTICE OF HEARINGS—REAPPORTIONMENT OF STATE LEGISLATURES

MR. BAYH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I wish to announce further hearings on the matter of reapportionment of State legislatures. These hearings will be held on May 14, 1965, in room 2226 of the New Senate Office Building beginning at 10 a.m.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

MR. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the nomination of Leonard C. Meeker, of New Jersey, to be Legal Adviser of the Department of State.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. TALMADGE:

Editorial and obituary on the late Dr. Ferdinand Phinizy Calhoun, of Atlanta, Ga.

By Mr. JAVITS:

Article entitled "Reapportionment Perspectives: What Is Fair Representation?" written

by Robert G. Dixon, Jr., and published in the "American Bar Association Journal" for April 1965, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.

By Mr. THURMOND:

Article entitled "Communists Had Voting Program Like Johnson's," written by Henry J. Taylor, and published in the Birmingham Post-Herald of April 16, 1965.

Editorial on attempts to punish the South, broadcast over Station WOKE, in Charleston, S.C.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Resolution in support of the Supreme Court's reapportionment decision, adopted by the Young Democratic Clubs of America.

By Mr. CHURCH:

Poems on the Indians of Idaho, written by Phillip William George, of Lapwai, Idaho.

URGING LUIS MUÑOZ-MARÍN TO BE U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

(Signature)
MR. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, President Johnson would be well advised if he were to recall U.S. Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett, Jr., as our Ambassador to the Dominican Republic. Ambassador Bennett is, in my judgment, the sort of ambassador who misrepresents us in Latin American countries and who is typical of the striped-pants State Department and Foreign Service officers who denounce as Communists any Latin American leader who opposes the wealthy economic and military oligarchies that control many of our neighbors to the south. In the myopic mind of Ambassador Bennett, a leader such as Juan Bosch and leaders in Brazil, Bolivia and other Latin American Republics, who seek to expropriate by legal actions vast land holdings of absentee landlords and distribute them to the impoverished, helpless and well-nigh hopeless underprivileged peasants and laborers of these countries are automatically suspect as Communists. No doubt he regards Juan Bosch as a Communist or at least a Communist sympathizer. Of course, it is well known that he is neither.

Events of the past few weeks indicate that Ambassador Bennett is the sort of State Department officer who is unable to distinguish between truly democratic elements in the citizenry of other countries and the Communist elements. In my opinion he is on the side of militarists and fascist elements.

That we have been misrepresented or inadequately represented in the Dominican Republic is indicated by the fact that our President has dispatched as a special envoy, John Bartlow Martin, in whom the people of the Dominican Republic apparently have confidence and who I am sure has the confidence of my colleagues.

Mr. President, I urge that our President appoint as Ambassador to the Dominican Republic, not only a great American administrator, diplomat and leader, but one of the foremost statesmen of the entire free world—the former Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Luis Muñoz-Marín. I hope and believe this great American patriot would accept this post if offered. With him as Ambassador and the Organization

May 12, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9951

Article 31

The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall inform all States Members of the United Nations and the other States referred to in article 26:

(a) Of signatures to this Convention and of the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession, in accordance with articles 26, 27 and 28;

(b) Of the date on which this Convention will come into force, in accordance with article 29;

(c) Of requests for revision in accordance with article 30.

Article 32

The original of this Convention, of which the Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall send certified copies thereof to all States referred to in article 26.

In witness whereof the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed this Convention.

Done at Geneva, this twenty-ninth day of April one thousand nine hundred and fifty-eight.

STATUS OF RATIFICATIONS OF 1958 CONVENTION
ON THE TERRITORIAL SEA

United States, Australia, Bulgaria, Byelorussian S.S.R., Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, Finland, Haiti, Hungary, Israel, Portugal, Rumania, Ukrainian S.S.R., U.S.S.R., United Kingdom, Venezuela, South Africa, Cambodia, Malaysia, Senegal, Malagasy Republic, Uganda, Italy, Nigeria, Sierra Leone.

MR. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the legislation I introduce today would implement the Convention on the Territorial Sea by requesting the President to direct that all necessary research be accomplished to indicate on a large-scale official map the baseline for measuring the breadth of the territorial sea as is specifically required by article 3 of the convention, including the employment of straight baselines where appropriate under article 4 of the convention.

This convention contains 32 articles and is the most important of the 4 conventions adopted in Geneva from the standpoint of sea boundaries. The first two articles of the convention provide that the sovereignty of a nation extends beyond its land territory and its internal waters to a belt of sea called the territorial sea. Articles 3 to 13 involve the determination of the boundaries of the territorial sea. In these determinations, two boundary concepts are involved. The first is an inner one referred to as the baseline and the second is an outer one which is dependent upon the breadth of the territorial sea. The United States adheres to a 3-mile territorial sea.

In addition, the baseline is the line from which the boundaries of any contiguous zone is measured. Article 24 of the convention recognizes the establishment of contiguous zones which may extend up to 12 miles beyond the baseline for customs, fiscal, immigration or sanitary regulations. The United States established, by an act of Congress in 1935, a 12-mile contiguous zone for purposes of customs and fiscal regulation. Moreover, under the same 1935 act, the President has authority to establish customs enforcement areas up

to 50 nautical miles beyond the 12-mile custom zones to prevent the unlawful introduction of merchandise or persons into the country. The Territorial Sea Convention does not mention contiguous zones for fishery regulation, although many nations, including many which have ratified the convention, have established contiguous zones not to exceed 12 miles for purposes of fishery regulation. At the 1958 Geneva Conference on the Law of the Sea, the decision was made to treat fisheries under a separate convention, which to date has not been ratified by the necessary 22 nations. However, I personally, and other Senators, have advocated a 12-mile fishery zone for the conservation of U.S. fishery resources for several years. When this proposal is accepted, and I am convinced it will be, it will be necessary to have measured and certain the baseline from which to determine the breadth of the 12-mile fishery zone. This will be accomplished under the proposed bill.

The baseline also represents the inner limits of the Continental Shelf and the high seas. The accurate establishment of baselines is, therefore, also significant for determining whether offshore oil exploration is being undertaken on State or Federal land.

In my opinion, this matter is of utmost urgency. Not only does the United States have an obligation as a party to the convention to mark on an official map the baseline for measuring the limits of our territorial sea but we have a definite need to do precisely this because of the increasing pressure from foreign fishing efforts in our coastal waters. I have been advised that there is at the present time no official map designated as such as required by the convention. Our international obligation in this respect is quite clear. But I would like to emphasize also the importance of meeting this obligation as a means of assisting the enforcement of legislation enacted by Congress last year which I introduced and which imposes strict penalties on any foreign fishing vessel that engages in the fisheries in our territorial waters.

At the present time, the Coast Guard which has primary responsibilities under that act has available at best only an approximation of the boundaries of our territorial sea. They do not even have that for many areas off the Alaska coast which is the area under the heaviest pressure at present from foreign fishing operations. Additional studies and investigations will be necessary before such an official map can be completed. But these studies must be undertaken and must, in my opinion, be undertaken immediately.

The bill I introduce today would not only request the President to prepare this official map but would express the sense of Congress that in the preparation of the map the United States should adhere to the convention method of employing straight baselines where the coastline is such that it will permit. This, I should point out, is the major change being proposed in this legislation in regard to the principles presently used to mark the limits of our territorial sea. The straight baseline principle is applicable to irregular coastlines such as we have in the

North Atlantic and more particularly in Maine, and in the North Pacific specifically in Alaska. It may be applicable to other areas as well such as those off the gulf coast off Louisiana. However, the extent of the application of the straight baseline principle is uncertain because sufficient search has not been accomplished. This proposed legislation would assure its accomplishment in the interest of the United States and pursuant to present U.S. international obligations.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1954) to protect coastal fishery and other resources by implementing the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS
OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 178

MR. DOUGLAS submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 180 THROUGH 183

MR. HARTKE. Mr. President, I send to the desk four amendments to the social security amendments bill H.R. 6675, now under consideration by the Finance Committee. Two of these are in substance identical to bills which I offered earlier in the session. They are S. 1787, to establish a drug stamp plan as a supplement to the medical and hospital provisions of the medicare bill, and S. 1490, which calls for removal of the limitation on earnings for those who are receiving social security benefits. The third increases allocation of certain funds for the Virgin Islands from \$330,000 to \$500,000. The fourth amendment is the same as my bill S. 2060 of the 88th Congress, which would allow the payment of old-age insurance benefits to a fully insured beneficiary at age 60, if he has exhausted his unemployment compensation benefits without finding new employment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments were referred to the Committee on Finance.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965—
AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 179

MR. SPARKMAN proposed amendments to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute (No. 124) proposed by Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN) to the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the

May 12, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9953

of American States taking over the policing of the Dominican Republic, order undoubtedly would be restored. No other action that the President can take would do more to restore confidence in our policies by leaders and citizens of Latin American nations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Our President was justified in relying on the recommendations of Ambassador Bennett at the outset. The Dominican Republic is within our sphere of influence in the Western Hemisphere. Of course, we cannot and will not tolerate any Communist takeover in that little island.

Not one American civilian has been killed in the rioting or revolt in the Dominican Republic. The continued presence of Ambassador Bennett can only serve to encourage Communist elements throughout Latin America. His inadequacy has apparently been recognized by the appointment of a special envoy.

Dan Kurzman, staff writer for the Washington Post, reports that Col. Francisco Caamano Deno of the so-called rebel forces, although the military junta which deposed the duly elected President are in reality rebels against law and order, states that Ambassador Bennett laughed when he asked him to help him end the bloodshed. Colonel Caamano was ready to agree to a ceasefire and to negotiate with the military junta seeking peace. Bennett refused to mediate. He said he had no authority to do so. It is said he laughed scornfully at Colonel Caamano. Ambassador John Bartlow Martin, later dispatched by our President, immediately took part in mediation efforts.

It is time we withdrew all of our marines except those who will be members of the peacekeeping force of the Organization of American States. Our military advisers and Ambassador Bennett caused nearly 25,000 men of our Armed Forces to be sent into this island city. This could be likened to using a sledge hammer to drive in a tack. Furthermore, Ambassador Bennett aided and abetted Gen. Wessin y Wessin of the militarists.

I am hopeful that without delay free democratic elections will be held in the Dominican Republic. The appointment of Luis Mufioz-Marin as our Ambassador to the Dominican Republic would be a great step toward restoring law and order in that nation and a sign of our good intentions for liberty-loving oppressed people throughout Latin America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column of Drew Pearson published in the Washington Post of Wednesday, May 12, under caption "Past Ignored in Island Crisis," be printed in the Record, at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 12, 1965]

PAST IGNORED IN ISLAND CRISIS

(By Drew Pearson)

Those who have worked with and watched President Johnson close up during the Vietnamese and Dominican crises predict that his No. 1 problem will continue to be foreign affairs.

This is because, while he knows legislative problems as no other President in history, he has an intimate feel for education, agriculture, poverty, taxes, economics, and the entire field of domestic problems; he does not have a feel for foreign affairs. It is also because every President to some extent is a prisoner of those who feed him information, who advise him on problems he does not know firsthand.

In view of the fact that the Dominican crisis has set back our Pan American relations 30 years, it is important to call the roll of advisers who gave the President bum steer and what they did:

Ambassador Tapley Bennett in Santo Domingo flew to Washington 2 days before the crisis, told the State Department the political situation was deteriorating, but predicted no revolution.

Three days after the revolt started and 1 day before Mr. Johnson landed the marines, Col. Francisco Caamano Deno, now rebel provisional President, came to see Bennett, offered to negotiate a cease-fire. The Ambassador laughed in his face. This infuriated Caamano. He went back to fight harder than ever. This fighting contributed to the decision to land marines.

SOURCE UNKNOWN

After the marines landed, Ambassador Bennett sent them into the front lines to fight alongside and relieve the troops of Gen. Wessin y Wessin, who last year had helped kick out President Bosch, first duly elected President in 32 years. The sight of U.S. Marines fighting to support Gen. Wessin y Wessin infuriated the pro-Bosch forces, created a lot of anti-American bitterness.

In Washington, Assistant Secretary of State Jack Vaughn and Elsworth Bunker, cool-headed Ambassador to the OAS, both favored full consultation with OAS Ambassadors. They had little chance to make their point. The person L.B.J. leaned on was his old Texas friend, Tom Mann, rapidly promoted by Mr. Johnson to be No. 3 man in the State Department. Last year, Mann called in U.S. envoys, made it clear that the United States would support military regimes on this continent.

The President has no conception of the long, tough battle Latin Americans have waged to ban intervention by the "Colossus of the North." He has no conception of Latin American hatred for marines. They have become a symbol of "Yankee imperialism." Even if he had sent the U.S. Army instead of the marines, reaction would have been better.

The President has no realization of the fact that the standard excuse for landing marines in Latin America has been the danger of communism.

OLD "RED HERRING"

I recall that when President Coolidge landed marines in Nicaragua in 1927, the first excuse was the protection of American property. Then Under Secretary of State Robert E. Olds called in Kirke Simpson, of the AP; Ludwell Denny, of the UP, and Maurits Hallgren, of the INS; gave them a "no attribution" story that communism was penetrating Nicaragua, the Panama Canal was in danger. Denny and Hallgren refused

to carry the planted piece unless the State Department could be quoted. There was no threat of communism in Central America in 1927.

This month, 38 years later, the Johnson administration first used the excuse of protecting American lives for landing marines; then brought out the old excuse of communism.

The real fact is that one-third of the Dominicans are unemployed, which breeds unrest, communism, and a bitterness in which rebels do not particularly care whether they die sniping at American marines.

Finally, Mr. Johnson has not sweated through the international conferences in which Latin diplomats slowly built up the doctrine of nonintervention in Pan American affairs. Their first real progress came at the 1928 Pan American Conference in Havana, which I covered for the Christian Science Monitor. Calvin Coolidge, then President, opened the Conference. Secretary of State Frank B. Kellogg was a delegate, as was Charles Evans Hughes, elder statesman of the Republican Party.

Latin Americans were then boiling over the 1927 landing of U.S. marines in Nicaragua. So at this Conference, three distinguished Republicans, Coolidge, Hughes, and Kellogg, accepted the doctrine of nonintervention.

President Johnson's hardnosed advisers permitted him in 1 hour to kiss off 38 years of better understanding in the Western Hemisphere without consulting a single Latin neighbor.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON FEDERAL PAY INCREASES

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the President has just submitted to Congress a message on pay increases for Federal classified workers and military personnel in service. The message was based on the report of a committee, which he mentioned in his message of January 25, 1965, known as the President's Special Panel on Federal Salaries, which was to review Federal military and civilian pay levels. This was an outstanding committee, headed by Marion Folsom, who has given many years of service to the Government and who has recommended many important programs in the interest of our citizens generally and particularly the classified Federal workers.

The President's message proposes an average increase of 3 percent in Federal civilian salaries; an average increase of 4.8 percent in the compensation of all uniformed personnel, except enlisted personnel with under 2 years of service; and a 2.7 percent increase in the base pay of enlisted personnel having less than 2 years of service.

In his message, the President suggests that a committee be established to study proposed pay increases in future years. That proposal, in my opinion, while it has merit, will require hearings and study by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I mention one item in connection with the proposed pay increase, which the President states will cost approximately \$853 million—\$447 million for uniformed personnel and \$406 million for civilian personnel. This is the sentence about which I wish to comment:

In order to hold the costs of pay adjustments in the fiscal year 1966 within amounts included in the budget for that purpose, I

May 12, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9909

Mr. George W. Andrews with Mr. Baring.
 Mr. Roush with Mr. Holland.
 Mr. Purcell with Mr. Resnick.
 Mr. de la Garza with Mr. Hamilton.

Mr. McCLORY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND
REMARKS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those Members who desire to do so may be permitted to extend their remarks in the body of the RECORD during debate on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that those of us who spoke during the course of debate on the bill just passed may include extraneous matter in their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I find that other official responsibilities make it necessary for me to resign from the Committee on Education and Labor. Please accept this letter as my resignation.

I have appreciated this honor very much and thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL FINDLEY,
Representative in Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION FROM COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: In view of my pending assignment to the House Education and Labor Committee, I herewith tender my resignation effective immediately as a member of the House Government Operations Committee.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. GURNEY.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO
COMMITTEES

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 383

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Education and Labor: ENWARD J. GURNEY, of Florida.

Committee on Government Operations: JOHN W. WYDLER, of New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION FOR
CERTAIN RIVER BASIN PLANS TO
COVER FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6755) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6755, with Mr. HANNA in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

[Mr. JONES of Alabama addressed the Committee. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill came out of the Committee on Public Works by a unanimous vote. The amount authorized, \$263 million, is included in the budget. This is the authorization bill that would be required, however, before those budget items can be included in the public works appropriation bill which will follow a little bit later in this session. The main objective of our committee in bringing this bill out at this time is to try to avoid the most unfortunate situation which happened 2 years ago when we had some river basins which ran out of funds. There was a delay here in Congress in getting a new authorization bill through for them. We had some extremely unhappy situations arise because of contracts already let, which were part way constructed, on which they ran out of funds. The most difficult problem of all that occurred 2 years ago occurred in the Los Angeles-San Gabriel River Basin in California. On that river basin 2 years ago contracts had been let and they ran out of the authorization when the contracts were to the point where the projects were half way constructed. There were people who had great quantities of earth dumped on their front lawns and great dredging of ditches in front of their property when the contractor and his men had to go off the job

because there was no longer any funds to carry them through. In some cases that situation was a constant threat. In fact, the local agencies in that area had to lend funds to the Corps of Engineers to try to tie together some of those loose ends.

This is something the Congress should not allow to happen. Therefore our committee is bringing this bill to the floor of the House today to try to get these authorizations through in time so that funds can be made available for these contracts and so that we can avoid this kind of situation and keep it from developing. Whenever we have a gap and contractors have to leave the job, we actually lose continuity of construction. We increase the construction costs, also, because the contractors have to pull equipment and men away from the job and go somewhere else. This is not a good way to conduct the business of doing an effective flood control job.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill will pass here in the House today with a unanimous vote, and I very much hope that the other body will give consideration to this bill on an urgent basis, because according to the information we have from the Corps of Engineers, unless this bill is passed and passed very promptly, we will have 47 contracts which will have to be deferred within the next 2 months, and it would be a tragedy if this happened.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDWIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman has made a very constructive contribution to putting across the urgency of this measure. I certainly want to commend him for it. Also I would like to say that we are certainly delighted that he is back from spending some little time in the hospital, as did our colleague from Alabama [Mr. JONES] because his help on this bill has been invaluable to the committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. I thank the gentleman.

(Mr. KUNKEL (at the request of Mr. BALDWIN) was given permission to insert his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. KUNKEL'S remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this bill.

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge passage of H.R. 6755, a bill to increase the fiscal 1966 authorizations for projects being built by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in 10 river basins.

Of immediate and important interest to my home State of Iowa is the provision for increasing by \$14 million the authorization for the Upper Mississippi River Basin. This increased authorization is necessary so that work can continue on the Red Rock Dam and Reservoir project, now under construction on the Des Moines River in south-central Iowa.

The Corps of Engineers, in testimony April 27, 1965, before the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the House Public Works Committee, indicated that several phases of the project, involving contracts totaling more than \$1.8 million,

9910

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 12, 1965

would be delayed unless the Congress approves the new authorization promptly.

The need for flood control projects such as Red Rock is obvious, and it should be all the more apparent because of the heavy floods in the Upper Mississippi River Basin this spring.

The Des Moines River was swollen by floodwaters, as were many other rivers in the area. The Office of Emergency Planning estimates that flooding in Iowa resulted in nearly \$5 million in damage. This is the amount of damage that has been determined thus far. It is quite likely that the actual damage will run much higher.

The Corps of Engineers has informed me that, on the Des Moines River, flooding caused about \$850,000 in damage at points on the river from the Red Rock damsite downstream to the confluence with the Mississippi River.

This is a routine bill. But it is badly needed to avoid delay on flood control projects, both in Iowa and in other parts of the country. I therefore urge that the House of Representatives act favorably on this measure today, so that it can be sent to the Senate for approval there at the earliest possible date.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, the State of Iowa has been ravaged by the most devastating floods in the history of the Upper Mississippi River Valley. I am sure that the people of southeast Iowa applaud the recognition which the House of Representatives has given them today in responding to the seriousness of the situation. The appropriation for Red Rock Reservoir which will allot \$15 million to provide flood control protection on the Des Moines River is vitally needed. The allotment of \$30,000 for Coralville Reservoir improvements and \$628,000 for the needed completion of the Coralville-Mehaffy Bridge is of tremendous economic importance to the people of the Iowa and Cedar River Basin.

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Chairman, the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin which was first approved by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, has benefited my district of Nebraska immensely. The Flood Control Act of 1944 provided additional advantages for the eastern section of Nebraska. Today there is a need for the expansion of the Missouri River Basin comprehensive plan. One of the needs is for additional recreational facilities for our people.

I believe that it is necessary that we pass this bill in order that we might provide for the ever-demanding needs of people for recreation. My district needs additional recreational facilities. This bill will provide funds for the development of recreational facilities for the people of the First Congressional District of Nebraska at the Gavins Point Reservoir and the Harlan County Reservoir, in Nebraska. Although not in my district, this lake is used by many people in eastern Nebraska. I believe the proposed amounts of \$90,000 for the Gavins Point Reservoir and the \$50,000 for the Harlan County Reservoir to be spent for recreational development is a step in the right direction. These two recreational facilities will provide the people in my district with numerous

opportunities to avail themselves of water recreation. The passage of this bill will provide such an opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I support this proposed legislation.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 6755 provides an authorization of \$11 million for 1 fiscal year for the central and southern Florida flood control project. I appreciate the committee including the project in its legislation for fiscal year 1966, and express the hope that the committee would approve an authorization for this project for 2 fiscal years in its next action.

The Central and Southern Florida Flood Control District presently has \$2.8 million in authorizations left for fiscal year 1966. The Corps of Engineers has indicated a capability of \$15 million for flood control works in fiscal year 1966, and the committee's action allowing \$11 million would bring the total authorizations to \$13.8 million in the next fiscal year. Even with the approval of the \$13 million for the central and southern Florida flood control project as included in the President's budget for fiscal year 1966, the remaining monetary authorizations are marginal and present planning difficulties to the Federal and State agencies concerned.

The flood control project has meant a great deal to Florida. It is a critical necessity in an area where land once inundated by floods has been turned into use in one of the Nation's fastest growing areas. And the results have been excellent, as judged by the fact that of some \$175 million in funds invested in the Central and Southern Florida Flood Control District, there has been a return of some \$200 million in benefits.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 6749, to provide a monetary authorization of \$30 million for 2 fiscal years, and urge that congressional approval be given to long-range authority for this project. Short-range planning can be costly for the uncertainty causes interruptions. Already the Corps of Engineers has canceled invitations to bid on two Central and Southern Florida Flood Control District projects, and I am advised that the corps may be forced to cancel two more contracts already awarded for construction works.

Mr. Chairman, the Central and Southern Florida Flood Control District spans all or part of 18 counties in Florida. I respectfully ask that consideration be given to providing authorizations for longer than 1 fiscal year in the next actions taken by the committee.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 6755

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, (a) in addition to previous authorizations, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan of development of each river basin under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army re-

ferred to in the first column below, which was basically authorized by the Act referred to by date of enactment in the second column below, an amount not to exceed that shown opposite such river basin in the third column below:

Basin	Act of Congress	Amount
Arkansas River	June 28, 1938	\$115,000,000
Brazos River	September 3, 1954	6,000,000
Central and Southern Florida	June 30, 1948	11,000,000
Columbia River	June 28, 1938	73,000,000
Los Angeles-San Gabriel	August 18, 1941	10,000,000
Missouri River	June 28, 1938	24,000,000
Ohio River	June 22, 1930	3,000,000
Ouachita River	May 17, 1950	1,000,000
Upper Mississippi River	June 28, 1938	14,000,000
West Branch Susquehanna River	September 3, 1954	6,000,000

(b) The total amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act shall not exceed \$263,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HANNA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6755) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 381, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

U.S. POLICY IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC IS A COMMITMENT TO HEMISPHERIC SECURITY AND WORLD PEACE

(Mr. SELDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the events of recent days make it more than ever apparent that the only alternative to the present U.S. commitment in the Dominican Republic would be to see that nation go the tragic way of Castro's Cuba.

Despite a heavy propaganda din by some of the same fatuous observers who helped pave Castro's road to power in the 1950's, the evidence accumulates that so-called Dominican rebel forces, if success-

May 12, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

9911

ful, would establish a second Communist base in the Caribbean.

Critics of the President's action in moving to meet the Communist threat to the Dominican Republic fail to grasp the essential lesson to be learned from the tragedy of Cuba's fall to Castro communism. The establishment of a Communist base in the Caribbean has imperiled hemispheric security and endangered world peace. Had President Johnson failed to meet the Communist menace to the security of the people of Hispaniola, the door would be opened wide to Red takeovers, not only along the Caribbean but throughout Latin America.

This is to say, as these critics seem to overlook, that the same "domino theory" which has committed American forces in Vietnam also applies to the nations of the Western Hemisphere. Hemispheric policy, set forth in numerous Inter-American meetings in recent years, provides for the isolation and ultimate removal of the Communist cancer in Havana. The emergence of a second Red base in the Caribbean would effectively destroy this policy and the entire fabric of the Inter-American system itself.

What are the purposes of the Inter-American system if not to protect the member States and peoples of our hemisphere from becoming, as have the tragic people of Cuba, mere satellites of an alien power?

The OAS—

Declares the Department of State in setting forth the legal basis for our country's actions in the Dominican Republic—

thus exists to assist the American States to maintain their rights to defend their integrity and to provide for their preservation and prosperity.

The action of the United States—

Continues this State Department analysis—

has given the organs of the OAS the essential time in which to consider the situation in the Dominican Republic and to determine means of preserving the rights that country has under the Inter-American system.

Certainly, the matter of sending in U.S. forces to maintain order in a neighboring country is not a course desired by any American President. But the alternative course—that is, to have done nothing at all—would have endangered not only the life and property of U.S. citizens and other foreigners in Santo Domingo, but the very security of our hemisphere. Once before in the past decade the U.S. Government, beguiled by the propaganda din of those who represented Fidel Castro as a mere "agrarian reformer," miscalculated its hemispheric responsibilities. The results proved tragic to the people of Cuba and the hemisphere. Eventually, underestimating and miscalculating the true scope of Communist aims in the Americas, we came to the brink of a third world war.

It is well then that the Johnson administration has demonstrated by its timely action in Santo Domingo that the United States has profited from the lesson of Castro and Cuba. Further, that

we regard our solemn commitments to curb and eliminate the Communist cancer from the hemisphere as more than mere words on a scrap of paper. For time and again in recent years the nations of our hemisphere have pledged their resources toward protecting the Americas from Communist subversive aggression. Now, the evidence is clear—for all who will study it—that U.S. action in the Dominican Republic has been directed solely toward that end.

The United States—

Asserted the Department of State in its statement on the Dominican situation—continues to support its commitment to the preservation of the right of all free peoples in this hemisphere to choose their own course, without falling prey to international conspiracy from any quarter.

That is the sum and substance of our country's current position in the Dominican Republic. It is the essence of our commitment as the leader of the Western Hemisphere. Any failure in that leadership at this critical time could result in tragedy, not only for the cause of freedom in the Americas, but throughout the world.

SMALL BUSINESS SUBCOMMITTEE
UNANIMOUSLY APPROVES LEGISLATION INCREASING DISASTER AID

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Subcommittee on Small Business of the House Banking and Currency Committee unanimously reported H.R. 8060 and its companion bill, S. 1796. This legislation grants additional benefits for victims of natural disasters, both in the form of an increase of \$50 million in SBA's revolving fund and more liberal terms in loans granted to disaster victims by SBA.

Passage of H.R. 8060 or S. 1796 in the shortest possible time is imperative so that loans made to victims of the recent floods and tornadoes can be made under the new terms.

I am including a copy of my opening statement on H.R. 8060 which was given this morning at the hearings conducted by the Small Business Subcommittee:

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN PATMAN ON H.R. 8060 AND S. 1796, TO PROVIDE FOR DISASTER VICTIMS

The bill before the Subcommittee on Small Business this morning would not be necessary if Congress were able to legislate against disasters. But, of course, we cannot make laws to prevent floods in our Midwest, nor can we legislate against tornadoes in the Southwest or, for that matter, any type of natural disaster in any part of our Nation.

However, we can provide legislation that will offer financial assistance to disaster victims so that they may rebuild their lives and property to a level equal to that before tragedy struck. H.R. 8060 and its companion bill, S. 1796, would help disaster victims in the following manners:

1. They would allow the Small Business Administration to increase the maturity of disaster loans from 20 to 30 years.
2. They would suspend payment for up to

5 years on the principal and interest of disaster loans at the discretion of the Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

3. If the request for suspension of the principal involves a participation loan, SBA, at the request of the lender, shall either purchase the participating lender's portion of the loan or make payments to the lender on behalf of the borrower during the suspension period in order to avoid default.

4. This legislation would also increase SBA's revolving fund by \$50 million.

There are many bills pending in the House of Representatives dealing with aid to disaster victims, most of them involving complex and comprehensive programs of rehabilitation. H.R. 8060 and S. 1796 are stopgap measures until fuller disaster legislation can be passed. Passage of these measures will in no way slow down the consideration of the other disaster measures before Congress.

The importance of H.R. 8060 and S. 1796 is underscored by the number of Senators who have taken time from their busy schedules to appear before this subcommittee or filed statements on behalf of the measures. It is my sincere desire that the subcommittee can take swift action on these bills and report them to the full committee today so that the new programs of aid will be available to the thousands of people who lost their homes and businesses in the recent midwestern disasters.

CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. VANIK
CITES PAST AND FUTURE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE SAVINGS AND LOAN INDUSTRY

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include an address by Congressman VANIK at Houston, Tex.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, few men in this country are more qualified to speak on finance and financial institutions than the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman CHARLES A. VANIK. As a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency for 10 years and now a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, he has become intimately acquainted with our Nation's financial system. More important, he is not only skilled in the technicalities of our financial laws and practices—he also has a deep understanding of their human significance.

Congressman VANIK yesterday delivered a speech to the annual management conference of the National League of Insured Savings Associations, in Houston. In it he describes how the savings and loan industry has grown to meet the need for lending institutions particularly directed to, and knowledgeable about, individual credit needs. He outlines the tremendous contributions savings and loan associations have made to this country, and he charts a course to assure them of an equitable position in relation to other credit institutions and of the opportunity to develop their potential fully.

This is an important speech for the savings and loan industry and for the Nation. The full text follows:

STATEMENT OF CHARLES A. VANIK, OF OHIO, HOUSTON, TEX., MAY 11, 1965

Mr. Chairman, my first words in the city of Houston must be words of gratitude for this community's representative in the U.S.

9912

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

May 12, 1965

Congress since, except for President Lyndon B. Johnson, there is no more beloved Texan in Washington than ALBERT THOMAS. Your distinguished Congressman is my friend and counselor. My colleagues and I have come to rely on his judgment—he is a Congressman's Congressman—rightly endowed with wisdom and warmth.

I come to this meeting with a profound high regard for the savings and loan industry and its contribution to the American scene. My experience in public life began in 1934, over 30 years ago. During the great depression, the great war, and the smaller Korean war, I have been witness to the early contribution of the savings and loan industry to recovery from depression and from war. I have been witness to your dramatic contributions to the housing of the returned veteran and the expanded formation of postwar family life. Twice in my own lifetime I needed home financing assistance. On each occasion I turned to a savings and loan association. The banks were strange and indifferent. The insurance loans were made primarily in large tract developments.

The great majority of my colleagues in the Congress share my views and my affection for your industry. They have had the same experience in the same times of change. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee for over 10 years, I know the pride and the respect which Chairman WRIGHT PATMAN has for your growth and your stability and your importance to the sound, economic growth of America. His predecessor, Brent Spence, of Kentucky, shared these same views. People in Government who know the financial institutions best—are joined in this concept.

The community and the people who I represent in my district are served infinitely more through the savings and loan institutions than through any other financial medium. They borrow their money from your institutions. They save their money in your institutions.

I am among those in the Congress who believe that your industry is mature and responsible. There is no need for "forced feeding" of statutes and the "spoon feeding" of regulations. It is for this reason that I oppose arbitrary and crippling Government controls over dividend rates—limitations and restraints on the income of the small saver who is your depositor. The Federal Reserve may have valid reasons for enacting regulation Q, but we must recognize that the decisions of the Federal Reserve Board are not purely public determinations. The policies of the Federal Reserve have a built-in guidance system—built in by your competitor—the banking industry. Since when has it become right to permit your competitor to fix his bid price for money in regulation Q and then insist that yours be fixed where it suits him best?

Competition at the marketplace is still a good creed for America. If your industry is capable of paying a higher interest rate and continues to loan money at attractive low rates, who wins—the saver, the borrower, the home buyer? It has been scientifically concluded that your industry can and must pay a higher differential rate for deposits. Your deposits and loans are longer in term. They require less servicing. You can pay a higher yield and make a cheaper loan. As long as the depositor's moneys are safe, you should be encouraged to do your best in the competition for business.

I believe that the present system of regional pricing for savings funds makes a great deal of sense and should be continued. The temporary pause in housing expansion has just about passed. We must be prepared for the dynamic surge in house building which is soon to overwhelm us. We must be ever mindful of our long-term needs in the housing area. A case has not been made for

the imposition of dividend rate controls on an industrywide basis. Nor should such control be extralegally imposed through economic sanctions—such as the denial of funds to an institution only because it offers a higher dividend rate.

If an institution is not sound or well managed the Home Loan Bank Board should certainly have the power to issue such orders as are necessary to protect the depositors. The Board should certainly have the power to issue cease-and-desist orders. However, an institution must have the right to appeal for relief in the courts. It is certainly entitled to judicial review after the Board's administrative procedures have been completed. But if an institution is otherwise sound and well-managed, it needs no instruction on what dividend it should pay.

As I understand it, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board is seeking new authority in the area of holding companies, supervisory powers and standby controls over savings and loan dividend rates. At the present time, the savings and loan holding company law prohibits any holding company from acquiring control of any additional savings and loan associations which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation. This Board is seeking powers, broadly speaking, to amend the present law to require savings and loan holding companies to register and file regular reports with the Board. In addition, the Board's proposals would confine holding company operations to a single State and require divestment of subsidiary associations in other States. Other provisions of the bill would subject holding companies to FSLIC examination and generally holding companies would be prohibited from carrying out transactions which an insured association could not by law perform.

The holding companies take the position that they are subject to supervision by State banking authorities and FSLIC with respect to insured associations and that the parent company must abide by the rules of the SEC. Others in your industry feel that holding companies by their nature operate with competitive advantages and should for this and other reasons be subjected to closer scrutiny by the Board through the FSLIC. This issue should be resolved in a way to insure institutional stability and also insure against unfair competition. I will watch carefully the deliberations of the banking committee.

To financial institutions—as with every other kind of American enterprise—taxes are at the root of substantially all concern. I am fully mindful of a disturbing feature of our tax laws under which a Federal association or a State-chartered association operating within the limits of its authority could fail to qualify as a domestic building and loan association under the Internal Revenue Code and thereby be deprived of the special sections of the code related to the taxation of the institution. I do not believe there is another instance or any other industry which is confronted with a tax section which is also a regulatory measure. Mutual savings banks qualify for the same tax provisions as savings and loans simply because they are mutual savings banks. They are not burdened to keep proving that they are what they claim to be.

Powerful competitive forces are also engaged in an effort to erode the tax status of the savings and loan institutions. One of my colleagues filed a bill several days ago which would treat savings and loan institutions the same as banks for the purposes. Such efforts must be decisively overcome. They are inspired by the same forces which would limit and restrict your dividend rate and the ultimate income of depositors. Your industry does a different job than the banks. You are restricted in the loans you make. You do not enjoy the

bonanza of cost-free money which banks are provided out of Federal funds and which the citizens provides in his commercial account deposits. Your loans are long-term, often 200 or 300 percent longer than the average commercial bank loan.

Your business entails considerably more risk as you obligate yourself to long-term loans at fixed interest rates. If interest rates should spiral, you must face the challenge of depositor demand for higher interest and the borrower's insistence upon the scheduled system of long-term repayment. You must be prepared to give the depositor his money at once and then wait three decades or more to get it from the borrower to whom you gave it. When my father signed a bank note and mortgage for the old homestead, he was promised a 15-year loan but was ordered to sign a demand note. When the depression came, the bank demanded the money and our family was at the wall of despair. This lesson will never be forgotten.

You need the tax reserves that the tax system now provides. The attack on this principle is absolutely and certainly a competitive attack on your very existence.

It is my hope that the current tug of war among financial institutions will meet a tolerable accord. It is certainly time that the factional infighting will subside and give the total industry a chance to catch up and permit the best segments of the industry to find their own level. Now is the time to chart a firm future course.

Frankly, I would like to see the commercial banks remain commercial—making loans to industry, corporate activity, and productive financing.

By the same token, I would like to see the savings and loan industry dominate in the individual loan field by serving the market for individual needs whether it be a home, a car, an appliance, a home improvement, or self-improvement as through an education loan. The cost of consumer credit is a staggering item in an annual family budget. In some low-family income groups interest can run as high as 25 percent of the total family budget.

The savings and loans are in unique position to serve these needs. No one has a better family history on the borrower than the institution serving a home mortgage. You know best how a family can manage debt or afford further debt for home remodeling, furniture, appliances, or education. The department store has become your competitor with 18-percent interest and unrestrained promotion. The debt managers have become your competitors with 1 percent per dollar per month.

By reaching the complete spectrum of family need your industry could provide quality service at less costs. The entire economy would benefit since it would precipitate increased buying, production, and utilization of goods. Your industry would be fulfilling its purpose.

The commercial banks already have a large and unique area of activity. They produce resources for commercial uses and for industry. They produce resources for your own use. The savings and loan industry has already become one of the biggest customers of the commercial bank supermarket of exclusive services.

There is thus under development a more clearly defined orbit of activity—banks in the commercial world, savings and loans in the individual family life. Neither class of institutions should endeavor to be all things to all people. Program should be developed which utilize the capabilities of each type of institution.

Our legislative and administrative leadership has a great stake in your industry. We want you to prosper and to grow. We want you to serve the growing needs of our people. We want to see your industry achieve the

May 12, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9977

have come oil and gas worth some \$120 million.

The next ferry to Anchorage was 2 days away; so we drove up the Sterling Highway and reached Alaska's largest city in time for lunch. We ate at the Top of the World restaurant crowning the Anchorage-Westward Hotel, which had miraculously survived the earthquake.

Below us, extending three blocks along Fourth Avenue, was a sunken field of bulldozed earth. Thirty-one stores, saloons, and pawnshops had stood there before the clay-sand earth slid away. Beyond lay the more modern section of the city, appearing at this distance to have been little damaged.

OFFSHORE OIL PROMISES NEW WEALTH

To the north we could see the anchorage for which the city was named in 1914—now a modern port facility. One hundred and thirty miles beyond, Mount McKinley rose above the horizon. To the southwest we looked past Turnagain, where 72 homes were destroyed by the quake, to the new offshore oil fields.

In the past Alaska has rewarded its people with fur, gold, copper, fish, and timber. Now oil promises to outdo all of them combined. What may become one of the richest oil areas in the world is just being opened. In the Kenai Peninsula, 50 wells now yield 30,000 barrels a day. Five major companies are drilling in Cook Inlet. Millions are being spent in testing possible fields north of the Brooks Range.

I hitched a ride to an offshore oil rig, called *Wodeco II*, in one of the helicopters which shuttle men and parts from Anchorage. This offshore drilling barge brought in one of the first wells in the inlet. Now there are 10, with more being drilled.

We stayed up most of the night while the crew struggled to install a blowout preventer on the well they were drilling. Diver Paul Greenke pulled on his suit as the riggers rushed to lower the 100,000-pound unit into place. During slack tide, near midnight, Paul would go to the bottom to direct the final fitting.

The men topside had to be ready or wait for the next tide change—an expensive delay where costs are \$600 an hour whether you're drilling or not.

I stood beside Paul on the slippery steel deck watching an operation which seemed chaotic, yet ruled by a certain frenzied order. Intuitive teamwork coordinated the work of oil-rig tool pushers, riggers, and roughnecks. The squealing of winches, the slamming of steel, and the clatter of huge ratchets drowned out the orders and answers yelled from level to level. At a signal, Paul stepped in the water. His assistant handed me one of the telephone headsets.

Paul had 25 minutes to go down, do the job, and get back. If the tide started to run, he would be pulled along with it. From 100 feet down in the 40° water he called for the rigger to lean the preventer to starboard. I could hear the bubbling of his breath over the phones as he felt for catches which had to snap into place.

After 8 minutes he called: "That's got it. Let's get out of here."

I took the crew boat back to Anchorage, getting there in time to fly over the epicenter of the great earthquake with a group from the National Academy of Sciences. The trip enabled me to see the last segment of the Alaska Ferry System.

The small ferry *Chilkat* carries 15 cars and 60 passengers between Valdez and Cordova on Prince William Sound. At Valdez we saw what was left of the town which had called itself the "Switzerland of Alaska." Destruction and risk had seemed great enough to warrant moving it to a safer location 4½ miles away. Its 600 residents will be relocated by 1967.

Some mountains were jolted 5 feet horizontally by the quake, according to the Coast and Geodetic Survey. On the way to Cordova we saw evidence that one small peak had literally been shaken to pieces, spreading 8 million tons of earth across the white surface of Sherman Glacier.

When its mines closed in 1938, Cordova had shipped more than \$100 million in copper ore. Today it depends mainly on fishing. But the town rose 6 feet during the earthquake, dumping most of the water out of the harbor and putting the canneries beyond reach of the boats. The Corps of Engineers has dredged out the harbor so that the docks are once again accessible.

As we returned to Anchorage by way of Montague Island, Dr. William E. Benson of the National Science Foundation pointed out new beaches of white barnacles where the south end of the island had tipped up. The ocean bottom in that area lifted as much as 50 feet—the greatest uplift on record.

In Anchorage our friends Joe and Donna Rychetnik had planned an Alaskan dinner for our last night. Judge Richard Collins brought pickled salmon from Cordova. Air Force Maj. Bob Reed contributed smoked salmon—squaw candy, as Alaskans call it. Airline Pilot Arnt Antonson flew in four whole king crabs from Kodiak that afternoon. Joe fried an Alaska-size platter of moose and caribou steaks from his freezer. Donna capped the meal with three baked Alaskas.

The next morning we started the long trip home to the South 48. The days were beginning to shorten, and the evening chill carried the first hint of the deep winter ahead. Yet winter has lost its sting for Alaskans. Ferries travel the year round, and the Haines Highway is kept open despite drifting snow.

As we drove away from Anchorage, a sign reminded us that the Alaska Highway, built during World War II, was opened to civilian traffic only 18 years before. It has been as important to this territory as was the Santa Fe Trail to our earlier frontier.

Now the marine highway has opened a new trail to the north. By 1966 Canada will have added a ferry link between Vancouver Island and the Alaska ferry system terminus at Prince Rupert. With already existing service from the State of Washington to the city of Victoria on Vancouver Island, this will complete the ferry route through the Inside Passage, a new lifeline from parent Nation to youthful State, speeding its great and imminent growth.

(Signature) THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC AND THE FUTURE OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the situation in the Dominican Republic has implications far beyond the confines of that little Caribbean country. Indeed, the future of the Organization of American States hinges on the role which the regional system assumes in resolving the Dominican situation.

A number of Latin American countries—principally, Mexico, Uruguay, Chile, and Peru—are incensed at President Johnson's decision to land troops in the Dominican Republic. They assert that the action constitutes a violation of the principle of nonintervention. These Latin American critics are joined by certain academic and other sectors of public opinion in the United States.

Since I was instrumental in prodding the United States toward adoption of the principle of nonintervention, in the first

place, and happily saw it put into practice, I believe that I can speak with some degree of authority regarding that cornerstone of our Latin American policy. On May 6, I spoke at some length about my role—first as managing editor of the Nation; then in conversations with Secretary of State Cordell Hull and President Roosevelt; then as the sole adviser to the U.S. delegation to the Seventh Inter-American Conference in Montevideo, in 1933—in persuading the United States to reverse its then-existing policy, and thenceforth to abjure intervention in the affairs of the other American Republics. I pointed out, however, that the abandonment of the right to unilateral intervention had a corollary, which was to make the Monroe Doctrine, in the words of President Roosevelt, a "joint concern of all the other American Republics." As such, the Monroe Doctrine will continue to serve the purpose of protecting the nations of this hemisphere that were valid at the time when it was proclaimed. As such, I reject the cry that it is obsolete. As a joint concern, it has been updated, and its validity reaffirmed and strengthened.

Thus, there are two sides to the coin of U.S. policy; on the one hand, we forswear intervention in the affairs of our smaller neighbors; on the other hand, continental peace and security are to be maintained by collective responsibility.

The success of this inter-American policy requires that both principles be made to function. In effect, nonintervention can be a reality only so long as an adequate collective system of security is available.

The impact of the cold war greatly complicated the operation of the inter-American system. The post-World War II environment in which the inter-American system had to function differed radically from the epoch in which the United States had accepted certain limitations on its freedom of action in this hemisphere. After World War II, the United States emerged as the leader of the free world—a position we neither coveted nor sought, but which circumstances thrust upon us. As such, we became the prime target of the Communist world. The Communists sought every opportunity to weaken U.S. power and prestige. Consequently, Latin America loomed as an inviting target. Latin America, although far from Communist armed might, became a magnet for Communist subversion.

Unfortunately, the inter-American system was generally organized to cope only with traditional threats. The Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, hammered out in 1947, and signed in 1948, does not speak specifically of collective action in the event of subversion. Instead, the Rio Treaty is generally designed to deal with armed aggression. As the new Communist tactic of subversion emerged, a number of Latin American countries clung to a narrow interpretation of the treaty. In their legalistic view, the sanctions provided by the Rio Treaty could be invoked only in the case of direct armed aggression. In 1954,

9978

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 12, 1965

we witnessed the reluctance of the Latin American countries to consider what was transpiring in Guatemala a threat to this hemisphere. Even after Castro's Marxist-Leninist ties were well established, even after 16 American nations had broken relations with Cuba, in protest over Castro's machinations in their countries, a number of other Latin American nations continued to resist collective responsibility for hemisphere peace and security.

On July 26, 1964, the inter-American system finally voted sanctions against Castro's Cuba, but only after the Venezuelan Government had presented incontrovertible proof that Cuba was directly involved in a plot to overthrow the Venezuelan Government. Fortunately, the Venezuelan Government had discovered the plot and a 3-ton cache of armaments in time to avert the catastrophe.

The ninth Meeting of Consultation did give some indication that the majority of Latin American countries were awakening to the dangers of Communist subversion in the hemisphere. The final act of the ninth Meeting of Consultation resolved, among other things, "to warn the Government of Cuba that if it should persist in carrying out acts that possess characteristics of aggression and intervention against one or more of the member states of the Organization, the member states shall preserve their essential rights as sovereign states by the use of self-defense in either individual or collective form, which could go so far as resort to armed force, until such time as the Organ of Consultation takes measures to guarantee the peace and security of the hemisphere."

Despite this attempt to redefine "aggression" to include the interventionary tactics practiced by Cuba, the question of effective collective action to nip off Communist subversion before a Communist government could be installed in a Latin American Republic remains very much an issue. In short, although the inter-American security system is prepared to meet the possibility of open military aggression by Communist forces against nations of the hemisphere, no plan for collective action against Communist subversive aggression has been developed.

The Dominican situation starkly reveals this essential weakness in the inter-American system of collective security. As I said on the floor of the Senate on May 10, no longer can there be argument over whether a Communist takeover was an imminent possibility in the Dominican Republic. Despite the fact that the press continues to question the validity of the Communist threat in the Dominican Republic, an official organ of the Organization of American States, sent to the Dominican Republic to investigate the situation, has spoken. On May 10, I promised to introduce into the RECORD, as soon as I could secure a translation, the entire proceedings of the 4th plenary session of the 10th Meeting of Consultation. At that session, four of the five Latin American Ambassadors sent to the Dominican Republic by the OAS Council were interrogated

for several hours by their colleagues about developments in the Dominican Republic. One member of the Special OAS Committee, the Ambassador of Panama, was not present, since he had remained behind in the Dominican Republic, to keep alive the Committee's presence in that tragic little country.

I urge all Senators to read carefully the minutes of the Fourth Plenary Session. The excerpts which I include in my remarks cannot convey the full flavor of the unanimous conclusions of the OAS Special Committee or the urgency of its appeal for speedy OAS action. Hence, I shall mention only a few, as illustrations. For instance, in answer to a question of whether "in the high command of the rebel group, there is now definite and significant Communist leadership," Ambassador Carrizosa, of Colombia, replied:

With regard to the sector led by Col. Francisco Caamaño, many diplomats accredited in the Dominican Republic, and I can include my country's diplomatic representative, feel that, if not Col. Francisco Caamaño, who I do not know to be personally a Communist, there are indeed numerous persons on his side that, if they are not members of the Communist Party, are actively in favor of Fidel Castro's system of government or political purposes. There is such a tendency in the opinion of many diplomats I spoke to, and I do not mention other countries in order not to commit countries represented here. They are firmly convinced that on that side there are many persons, I do not say members registered in an officially organized Communist Party, but persons who do have leanings toward a well-known trend prevalent in Cuba.

Shortly afterward, Ambassador Penna Marinho, of Brazil, answered in this way:

I should like to add, gentlemen, that with the complete collapse of public authority—since neither the forces of the government junta of Benito, Santana, and Saladin nor those of Colonel Caamaño were in control of the situation—the Dominican State practically disappeared as a juridical-political entity, and the country became a sort of no man's land. The arsenal had been given to the people and an entire disoriented population of adolescents and fanatics was taking up modern automatic arms, in a state of exaltation that was further exacerbated by constant radio broadcasts of a clearly subversive character.

Neither do I believe that I am, nor does any of the members of this committee believe that he is, in a position to state with assurance that the movement of Colonel Caamaño, inspired by the truly popular figure of former President Bosch, is a clearly Communist movement. But one fact is certain: in view of the real anarchy in which the country has been engulfed for several days, especially the capital city, where bands of snipers have been sacking and killing and obeying no one, any organized group that landed on the island could dominate the situation.

For that reason, and our understanding coincides with that of a majority of the depositions of the chiefs of diplomatic missions accredited there, all of the members of the committee agree in admitting that the Caamaño movement, fortunately truly democratic in its origins, since none of us sincerely believes that Caamaño is a Communist, could be rapidly converted into a Communist insurrection; above all it is seen to be heading toward becoming a government of that kind, susceptible of obtaining the

support and the assistance of the great Marxist-Leninist powers.

Therefore, Mr. President, we do not believe that Colonel Caamaño and his closest advisers are Communists. Meanwhile, as the entire Caamaño movement rests upon a truly popular basis, by certain areas escaping from the control of that democratic group of leaders it would be quite possible for that movement to be diverted from its real origins and to follow the oblique plan of popular-based movements, which can be easily controlled by clever agents and experts in the art of transforming democratic popular movements into Marxist-Leninist revolutions.

The Ambassador of Uruguay, who was not a member of the Special Committee, and whose government voted against invoking the OAS system in the Dominican crisis, asked this important question:

For this Meeting of Consultation to be competent to take measures to bring peace and to carry forward the work begun, it is necessary, above all, in the opinion of my delegations, to ascertain whether the situation in the Dominican Republic is a situation that can endanger the peace and security of the hemisphere. This is the requirement of article 19 of the Charter for carrying out collective action in matters that normally are within the domestic jurisdiction of the States.

As is well known article 19 states: "Measures adopted for the maintenance of peace and security in accordance with existing treaties do not constitute a violation of the principles set forth in articles 15 and 17," which are those that refer to nonintervention. Hence my delegation believes that a pronouncement must be made by this Meeting of Consultation to the effect that the events in the Dominican Republic constitute a situation that endangers the peace and security of the hemisphere. Departing from that basis, I should like to ask the committee if it is of the opinion that this is the case, that is to say, that the situation in the Dominican Republic constitutes a threat to the peace and security of the hemisphere.

The Uruguayan Ambassador's question goes to the heart of the controversy within the inter-American system—that is, whether the OAS is competent to deal with Communist subversion.

Mr. President, I strongly recommend that Senators read all the responses to this question. Here, as a sample, is part of the response by Ambassador Colombo, of Argentina, the president of the Special OAS Committee:

When, among the powers and duties, the duty of investigating was decided upon, I cannot conceal the fact that I felt the same as I always feel whenever an investigating committee is named. Generally it investigates nothing; few, indeed, are the investigating or factfinding committees which, in the parliamentary life of all of our countries, show any fruitful jurisprudence in their results.

But this investigating committee did have the possibility of good results. And that was because it was aimed at two fundamental objectives that were governing events in the Dominican Republic. I understood, first, that the investigation was to determine the scope of the danger resulting from the events, which are a matter of concern to the Ambassador of Uruguay. If this was a situation that did not threaten the peace, we would verify that immediately. If the situation was under the control of groups intent on stirring up tension in the Americas, in a struggle in the history of America, which is full of struggle between brothers, in this incorrigible vocation that is periodically written into the history of our countries, that

May 12, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9979

delays the advance of law and democracy, then we would verify it immediately; and we have verified it. This could be the beginning of a struggle confined to the two well-defined groups.

But the presence of those uncontrollable factors, which I urge the ambassadors to analyze in detail, in the evaluation of facts in order to reach conclusions, they are going to be impressed, as we ourselves were impressed, without seeing them; they have become more dangerous than the groups themselves put together. To my mind, they have become the element that will determine the fate of what is going to be done.

The fact remains that the special committee of the OAS recognizes the dangers inherent in the Dominican situation. In the process, the OAS has now been swept by the flood of events to face up to its responsibility for collective security. Should the OAS default, there would seem to be no alternative but for the United States, unilaterally, to pursue its vital interest in securing the Dominican Republic from Communist subversion.

I fervently hope that matters do not come to that. As one of the architects of the good neighbor policy, including the principle of nonintervention, I firmly believe that the inter-American system represents the best policy for all the American Republics to apply in defending their peace, security, and independence. Nevertheless, I believe—as President Kennedy stated in April 1961, after the abortive Bay of Pigs invasion:

Should it ever appear that the inter-American doctrine of noninterference merely conceals or excuses a policy of nonaction—if the nations of this hemisphere should fail to meet their commitments against outside Communist penetration—then I want it clearly understood that this Government will not hesitate in meeting its primary obligations, which are to the security of our Nation.

Let us remember that U.S. policy, as designed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Cordell Hull, had two prongs: a commitment to nonintervention, coupled with a responsibility for collective measures.

I assure my Latin American friends that my conviction that the United States should refrain from intervening in their internal affairs remains as devoted as it was during my struggle to get the United States to adopt such a policy. I sympathize with their historical fears with regard to their powerful northern neighbor. I recognize that weakness and instability of their governmental structures make it desirable to refrain from any action which might exacerbate their domestic leftwing forces. Nevertheless, I would say to my Latin American friends that it is time to bury the ghosts of the past. No longer can they afford the luxury of using the United States as a whipping boy for long-past offenses. In the world today, in the world of reality, not memory, the freedoms which Latin Americans profess to cherish are threatened, not by the United States, but by Communist forces. It would, indeed, be tragic if the Cuban missile crisis were forgotten in the rush of baseless fears which long ago should have been put to rest.

Mr. President, the Organization of American States stands at a crossroads.

It can go forward into the realities of the 1960's, or it can become paralyzed by shibboleths of a bygone era.

At the moment, the Inter-American system seems to be gradually inching forward. The special committee, whose opinions I include in today's RECORD, recognizes the obligations of the OAS to assume leadership in the Dominican crisis. Unhappily, the resistance encountered among a minority of the American republics has delayed swift action. Meanwhile, every day, every hour, every minute of hesitation complicates an already monumental task in the Dominican Republic. With every passing moment, tempers become more taut, positions harden, and lives are endangered. Dr. Mora, Secretary-General of the OAS, who remained in the Dominican Republic, has made repeated appeals for action.

I was deeply impressed by the fact that both sides in the present conflict—both Colonel Caamaño and Colonel Benoit—expressed to the OAS Special Committee their faith in the inter-American system and their desire to have it enter the picture. This being the case, there is a considerable element of hope that OAS intervention can help to pacify the country and to bring it to the point of holding democratic elections and establishing a constitutional government.

I lament the fact that the formation of a special commission of such experienced Caribbean senior statesmen as former Gov. Muñoz Marin, of Puerto Rico; Venezuelan ex-President Rómulo Betancourt; and former Costa Rican President José Figueres, was opposed by a few Latin American governments. I grant that all these men are controversial in certain circles in Latin America. But no man has achieved distinction without causing some controversy.

In fact, seldom does a man of character, conviction, and high purpose escape the label of "controversial." Nevertheless, there are many other able Latin Americans who can contribute to the construction of a viable, democratic government in the Dominican Republic. I was happy to learn that two eminent Ambassadors—Colombo, of Argentina; and García Bauer, of Guatemala—have returned, to represent the OAS on the scene.

Mr. President, it is urgent that the OAS act responsibly and quickly to end the fighting in the Dominican Republic and to supervise a disarmament of the populace. So long as the two opposing forces face each other, with U.S. marines in the middle, there is an ever present danger of conflict in which their involvement would further diminish the chance of a peaceful settlement, and would furnish more fuel for Communist propaganda.

But the establishment of peace will not be enough. It is equally important that the OAS recognize that its duty goes beyond the restoration of peace. Tranquillity will be permanent in that long-suffering island only with the establishment of a viable, democratic government. President Johnson has stated that this

is the U.S. aim, that the United States wants neither a dictatorship of the left nor a dictatorship of the right. I commend the President; and I urge that the OAS assume responsibility for the achievement of this desirable objective.

The job will be arduous. The inheritance of 32 years of the brutal and venal Trujillo tyranny is still with us, plus the earlier Dominican history of alternating chaos and dictatorship. This must be rooted out by the OAS, so that the Dominican people will have an opportunity to participate fully in the citizenship of a democratic nation. Only then can the hemisphere be hopeful that there will not be a repetition of the events of the last 2 weeks.

Whatever the outcome of the Dominican crisis, it is now clear that the question of subversion in the Western Hemisphere must be faced squarely. The inter-American system, the product of 75 years of painstaking development, and with a proud record of achievement, must come to grips with the new challenges confronting the hemisphere in 1965.

I ask unanimous consent that the translation into English of the provisional text of the minutes of the fourth plenary session of the 10th meeting of consultation of the Organization of American States be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the translation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINUTES OF THE FOURTH PLENARY SESSION
(CLOSED)

(Document 46 (Provisional) May 7-8, 1965)

Chairman: His Excellency Ambassador Guillermo Sevilla Sacasa, special delegate from Nicaragua.

Secretary general of the meeting: Dr. William Sanders.

Present: Their Excellencies Alfredo Vázquez Carrizosa (Colombia), Roque J. Yódice (Paraguay), Alejandro Magnet (Chile), Ramón de Clairmont Dueñas (El Salvador), Rodrigo Jácome M. (Ecuador), Juan Bautista de Lavalle (Peru), Ricardo A. Midence (Honduras), Enrique Tejera Paris (Venezuela), José Antonio Bonilla Atiles (Dominican Republic), Humberto Calamari G. (Panama), Raúl Díez de Medina (Bolivia), Ricardo M. Colombo (Argentina), Carlos García Bauer (Guatemala), Rafael de la Colina (Mexico), Gonzalo J. Facio (Costa Rica), Emilio N. Oribe (Uruguay), Ellsworth Bunker (United States), Fern D. Baguidy (Haiti), Ilmar Penna Marinho (Brazil).

Also present at the meeting was Mr. Santiago Ortiz, assistant secretary general of the meeting of consultation.

Recording secretary: José F. Martínez.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

The PRESIDENT. Your Excellencies, I have the honor of opening the fourth plenary session of the 10th meeting of consultation of ministers of foreign affairs, which has been called for the principal purpose of receiving a confidential report from His Excellency, Ambassador Ricardo M. Colombo, Representative of Argentina and Chairman of the Special Committee that went to the Dominican Republic, which has prepared a confidential report. Ambassador Colombo addressed the following note to me today:

"Your Excellency, I have the honor of transmitting to you the first report of the Special Committee of the 10th meeting of consultation of ministers of foreign affairs

of the member states of the Organization. I respectfully request you to direct that this report be distributed to the Special Delegates to this Meeting of Consultation. Accept, Sir, the assurances of my highest consideration. Ricardo M. Colombo, Ambassador of Argentina, Chairman of the Special Committee."

First of all, I wish to express to His Excellency Ambassador Ricardo M. Colombo and to his distinguished colleagues on the Committee, Their Excellencies Ambassador Ilmar Penna Marinho, of Brazil, Ambassador Alfredo Vázquez Carrizosa, of Colombia, Ambassador Carlos García Bauer, of Guatemala, and Ambassador Frank Morrice, of Panama, the deep appreciation of the meeting, and especially of all of their colleagues, for the magnificent and efficient work they have done in carrying out the delicate mission entrusted to them by the Meeting. We have followed their work with a great deal of attention and interest, and feel proud of having appointed them; and we are sure that the Americas, our people and our governments, applaud that work, and this Meeting expresses its appreciation and praise for it. In accordance with the Regulations, plenary sessions are public. When I spoke this morning with our colleague Chairman of the Committee, it seemed to me appropriate that this meeting be closed, precisely because the report to be presented by Ambassador Colombo, in behalf of the Commission of which he is Chairman, is, precisely, of a confidential nature. This decision by the Chair, that this meeting be closed, I am sure will not be objected to by the Representatives. I am happy that everyone agrees that this meeting should be closed. This will be recorded in the minutes. I recognize the Ambassador of Argentina, His Excellency Ricardo Colombo, Chairman of the Special Committee, so that he may be good enough to present the report referred to in the note I had the honor of receiving this morning. The Ambassador has the floor.

Mr. COLOMBO (the Special Delegate of Argentina). Thank you very much, Mr. President. I should like to make clear, before beginning to read the report, that it begins by referring to the very time of our arrival, or rather, to our departure from Washington, for which reason we do not record here the fact, which we do wish to point out, that at the time of our arrival, and in compliance with a resolution of the Council of the OAS, the Secretary General of the Organization of American States, Doctor Mora, was already there carrying out his duties, regarding which he will give his own report.

[Reads the first report of the Special Committee]¹

Mr. COLOMBO. May the meeting consider the report to have been presented in behalf of the Committee duly appointed. Thank you very much, Mr. President, thank you very much, gentlemen.

The PRESIDENT. I take note of what Ambassador Colombo has just said, and, clearly, we have been most pleased with the report. Your Excellencies will have noticed its fine quality.

Mr. GARCIA BAUER (the Special Delegate of Guatemala). If the President will allow me, I should like to recommend to all the Delegates that they take the following note with respect to the document that contains the report of the Committee that has just been read, and has also just been distributed, pardon me. On page 9 there are certain errors that were made in transferring the text to the stencil. In the last line on that page, where it says "guardia de policía milit-

tar" the word "mixta" should be added, so that it will say "una guardia de policía militar mixta." On page 12, in the next to the last line from the bottom, where it says "y de que ésta mantendría," it should say "y de que mantendría los contactos." On page 13, at the end of the second paragraph, it is necessary to add "En la última parte de la entrevista estuve presente el General Véssin y Wessin y solicité de la Comisión," at the end of the paragraph. And on page 26, in the second paragraph, where it says "la resolución del 30 de abril" it should be "resolución del 1.º de mayo." [These corrections were taken into account before the English text of the document was issued.]

The PRESIDENT. The Chairman asks the distinguished members of the Committee whether they accept and consider incorporated in the text of their valuable report the observations made by His Excellency the Ambassador of Guatemala. The Chairman of the Committee.

The CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE. I fully accept them, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT. Undoubtedly we shall receive a second edition of this report containing precisely the amendments already accepted by the Chairman of the Committee.

Mr. GARCIA BAUER. Mr. President, they are not things to accept, but rather the question is that in the report of the Committee these points were omitted.

The PRESIDENT. That is just what I was referring to, that the Chairman of the Committee has precisely accepted the incorporation of the omitted matter, the clarifying of the points. He has accepted, as Chairman of the Committee, in behalf of all its members, that the observations should be taken into account in the new edition that is to be made of the report. In other words, they are corrections of form.

Mr. GARCIA BAUER. No, Mr. President, those are not corrections of form, they are omissions made in copying the report of the committee.

The PRESIDENT. Precisely, the Chair was mistaken, they are omissions of form, precisely. Gentlemen of the Special Committee, the report, which has just been read by your distinguished Chairman, Ambassador Ricardo M. Colombo, of Argentina, reveals a job done that the Chair would describe as extraordinary, very worthy of the sense of responsibility and the personal capabilities of the distinguished Ambassadors who make up this historic Committee on the inter-American system. Being extraordinary, it is a job worthy of our appreciation, of the appreciation of this Meeting of Consultation and of those of us who are honored to call ourselves colleagues of the Ambassadors who make up the Special Committee. In saying this, I am honored to confirm to you what I said to His Excellency Ambassador Ricardo Colombo in the message that I had the honor to address to him today, which reads:

"The Honorable Ricardo M. Colombo, Chairman of the Committee of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs: I am pleased to express to you and to your colleagues on the Committee of the Organization of American States established by the Tenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs the appreciation of the Meeting for the prompt and interesting information furnished in your two messages received on May 3 and 4. The Meeting has taken note of the messages and hopes that the important tasks being undertaken with such dedication and efficiency may soon be completed with full success. Accept, Sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration. Seville-Sacasa, President of the 10th meeting."

I have the satisfaction of informing you regarding a communication the Chair has received from His Excellency Emanuel Clarizio, Papal Nuncio, dean of the diplomatic corps

accredited to the Government of the Dominican Republic. It reads:

"Guillermo Sevilla-Sacasa, President of the Tenth meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs"—this communication is dated May 5—"I thank you with deep emotion for message Your Excellency sent me on behalf of Tenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs. I have sincere hopes that providential assistance by Organization of American States quickly begun in Santo Domingo by Secretary General Mora and happily assumed by Special Committee of worthy members headed by Ambassador Colombo will soon achieve for the beloved Dominican nation the humanitarian ideals of peace and well-being that inspire that high and noble institution." It is signed by Emanuel Clarizio, Papal Nuncio of His Holiness.

I said at the beginning that naturally this meeting is of a closed nature, which indicates that, at the proper time, a public plenary session should be held, in order publicly to take cognizance once again of the text of the report and the opinions expressed regarding it. It seems logical for the first step to be to obtain the second edition, as I call it, of this report, in which the omitted matter so correctly mentioned by our colleague from Guatemala will appear: in order that the General Committee of the Meeting of Consultation may take cognizance of the report and then submit its decision on it to the plenary. This is what the Chair has to report on the matter for the present, but naturally, we would like in this closed meeting, in the private atmosphere in which we are now, to hear some expression by some distinguished Representative on the text of the report that was read by the distinguished Chairman of the General Committee. The representative of Mexico, Ambassador de la Colina, has asked for the floor, and I recognize him.

Mr. DE LA COLINA (the Special Delegate of Mexico). First of all I wish to express, or rather, join in the comments that you, Mr. Chairman, have made in appreciation and deep recognition of the distinguished members of the Committee we took the liberty to appoint, in recognition of not only this wonderful report they have presented us, but also the efforts they doubtlessly have made under most difficult conditions and with great efficiency and dignity. Now I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, whether it would be possible to ask some questions, especially since we are meeting in executive session, for clearly our governments surely are going to want to know the very learned opinion of our distinguished representatives regarding some aspects touched on only incidentally in this most interesting report, with the reservation, naturally, that perhaps in a later session, also secret, we could elaborate on some other aspects that, for the moment, escape us. Would that be possible, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT. I believe the question is very important. The President attaches great importance to the question put by the Ambassador of the Republic of Mexico regarding our taking advantage of this executive session to ask the distinguished Committee some questions.

Mr. COLOMBO. I ask for the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT. You have the floor, Mr. Ambassador.

Mr. COLOMBO. The Committee is ready to answer, insofar as it can, any questions the representatives of the sister republics of the Americas wish to ask its members.

The PRESIDENT. Very well. Is the Ambassador of Mexico satisfied? You have the floor.

Mr. DE LA COLINA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the time being I would like to know whether it is possible, after having listened closely to everything our distinguished colleague, the Representative of Ar-

¹ The first report of the Special Committee, with the corrections indicated below by the Special Delegate of Guatemala and accepted by the other members of the Committee, has been published as Document 47 of the meet-

May 12, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9981

gentina, has told us. I have the perhaps mistaken impression, from the technique as well as from the quick reading I was giving this document we just corrected, that there seems to have been a certain consensus between the opposing sides as to the possible elimination of the generals. Perhaps I am mistaken, but it seems to follow from that reading and from this idea that on both sides the colonels were more or less disposed to create, let us say, a high command other than the one that has remained thus far. I wonder whether it would be possible for you gentlemen to elaborate on this, or whether you simply have no ideas on the matter.

The PRESIDENT. Would the Chairman of the Committee like to respond to the concern of the Representative of Mexico?

Mr. COLOMBO. With great pleasure. As the report states, Mr. President, the request to exclude the seven military men, whose names I have read in the Committee's report, was a complaint by the junta led by Colonel Caamaño and transmitted by the Committee to the military junta led by Colonel Benoit. The Act of Santo Domingo, furthermore, is clearly written, and the stamped signatures of the parties ratifying it are affixed. I believe I have responded to the concern of the Ambassador of Mexico.

Mr. DE LA COLINA. Another point now, if I may.

The PRESIDENT. With pleasure.

Mr. DE LA COLINA. I would like to know, if this is also possible, whether the distinguished representatives could give us their impressions regarding the degree of Communist infiltration in the rebel or constitutional forces, or whatever you want to call them. For example, there was the reference to this Frenchman *** who came from Indochina, and who trains frog men *** etc.; perhaps there is some thought that this person might have close ties, for example, with other Communists; or do they have the impression at least that, in the high command of that group, the rebel group, there is now definite and significant Communist leadership. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. COLOMBO. As for myself, I, as a member of the Committee, not as Chairman, have no objection to answering the question by the Ambassador of Mexico, but as a matter of procedure for answers, I wish to provide an opportunity for the Chairman to speak in general terms in order not to deny the distinguished members of the Committee their legitimate right to answer as members of the Committee, which we all are; that is, I would not want to be monopolizing the answers because, without prejudice to a given answer, we can give another of the members of the Committee an opportunity to give the reply that, in his judgment, should be given. Thus, in order to respect fair treatment and not find myself in the middle of the violent and inelegant position of monopolizing the answers—and I ask the members of the Committee whether some of them want to answer, because I, for my part, will indeed answer. Then I ask you to give the floor first to Ambassador Vázquez Carrizosa, of Colombia.

The PRESIDENT. The Ambassador of Colombia, member of the Special Committee, will answer the question by the Ambassador of Mexico.

Mr. CARRIZOSA (the Special Delegate of Colombia). Mr. President, the Representative of Mexico asks what the opinion is. I will state mine, because I am not going to answer on behalf of the Committee, as to the degree of Communist infiltration on both sides. Of course, the question must refer to the command or sector led by Colonel Francisco Caamaño, because I do not think it refers to any Communist leanings by General Wessin y Wessin, Colonel Saladin or any of his colleagues. With regard to the sector led by Colonel Francisco Caamaño, many diplomats accredited in the Dominican Republic, and I can include my country's

diplomatic representative, feel that, if not Colonel Francisco Caamaño, whom I do not know to be personally a Communist, there are indeed numerous persons on his side that, if they are not members of the Communist Party, are actively in favor of Fidel Castro's system of government or political purposes. There is such a tendency in the opinion of many diplomats I spoke to, and I do not mention other countries in order not to commit countries represented here. They are firmly convinced that on that side there are many persons, I do not say members registered in an officially organized Communist Party, but persons who do have leanings toward a well-known trend is prevalent in Cuba.

Mr. DE LA COLINA. Thank you, Mr. Ambassador.

The PRESIDENT. Does any member of the Committee wish to add to the answer requested by the Representative of Mexico? Is the Representative of Mexico now satisfied with the information given to him? The Ambassador of Guatemala.

Mr. COLOMBO. If the President will allow me, I do not know what system the President may have to gauge the kind of questions.

The PRESIDENT. Well, your Excellency said that he wanted his colleagues to participate in the answers in their, let us say, personal status, in order to distribute the task of answering, and, naturally, the President took note of the fact that your Excellency had invited his colleague from Colombia to answer the question put by the Ambassador of Mexico. I, by way of courtesy, am asking your Excellency whether any other colleagues would like to express their opinions on the same question the Ambassador of Mexico asked. I request your Excellency to tell me whether any other of his colleagues would like to ask any questions.

Mr. COLOMBO. I am going to add very little, of course, to what the Ambassador of Colombia, with his accustomed brilliance, has just said, by saying that this report, affirmed by a large number of representatives of the Diplomatic Corps, is public and well known to any one who cares to make inquiry. But despite the respect that I owe to the opinion of the Diplomatic Corps, in order to establish this in precise terms—for I was concerned as much as was the Ambassador with being able to verify this question—I wanted to go to the source; and we spoke with the different men who were in this rebel grouping and, a notable thing, from the head of the revolution, Colonel Caamaño, to some one known as Minister of the Presidency, they recognized that they were their great problem, they explained to a certain extent briefly the process of the history of the Dominican Republic, they confessed to us how gradually a number of elements were being incorporated with them whom they called communists, and that their problem was to avoid infiltration for the purpose of springing a surprise and seizing control. They said this clearly, and even at one point—I in the sometime difficult task of dividing this formal nomination of the chairmanship in which there is no merit greater than that of any one else, because perhaps in the other four members there is much talent for doing what the chairman did—I spoke with Colonel Caamaño and asked him in a friendly way whether he honestly believed that such infiltration existed. He confirmed this to me, but he gave me the impression that he had the courage to face it. He said to me: "They are not going to grab the movement, and my concern is that in their losing the possibility of control, they have stayed behind the snipers, today there are those that do not wish a solution for the Dominican Republic," and already he put the political label on a good part of the snipers on both sides? It should be said, Mr. Ambassador, that you will understand

the extent of responsibility of the answers and the depth of the questions, and I would like to satisfy your own concern; but I have fulfilled with loyalty by reporting the conversation to you objectively, telling you that I believe that those who have the answer to this question is to be found among the actors, the protagonists of this hour who are living in the Dominican Republic. This is what I wanted to say now, Mr. Chairman.

The PRESIDENT. Very well, Mr. Ambassador.

Mr. DE LA COLINA. Mr. Ambassador of Colombia, I greatly value this reply; I wanted both, but naturally with reference to the reply whereby you explain one more aspect. Many thanks, Mr. Ambassador.

The PRESIDENT. Would the Ambassador of Guatemala like to say something on the question put by the Ambassador of Mexico?

Mr. GARCIA BAUER (the Special Delegate of Guatemala). Mr. Chairman, for the moment, no; certainly this point was discussed in the Committee; the Committee also had a series of things, and since there is not yet any criterion of the Committee, I do not for the moment wish to present any viewpoint.

The PRESIDENT. The Ambassador of Brazil.

Mr. PENNA MARINHO (the Special Delegate of Brazil). Mr. President, I should like to corroborate the statements made by my colleagues from Colombia and Argentina, and add one more aspect that I believe could help to clarify the approach that could be given to the problem. I should like to add, gentlemen, that with the complete collapse of public authority—since neither the forces of the Government Junta of Benoit, Santana, and Saladin nor those of Colonel Caamaño were in control of the situation—the Dominican state practically disappeared as a juridical-political entity, and the country became a sort of no man's land. The arsenal had been given to the people and an entire disoriented population of adolescents and fanatics was taking up modern automatic arms, in a state of excitation that was further exacerbated by constant radio broadcasts of a clearly subversive character. Neither do I believe that I am, nor does any of the members of this Committee believe that he is, in a position to state with assurance that the movement of Colonel Caamaño, inspired by the truly popular figure of former President Bosch, is a clearly communist movement. But one fact is certain: in view of the real anarchy in which the country has been engulfed for several days, especially the capital city, where bands of snipers have been sacking and killing and obeying no one, any organized group that landed on the island could dominate the situation. For that reason, and our understanding coincides with that of a majority of the depositions of the chiefs of diplomatic missions accredited there, all of the members of the Committee agree in admitting that the Caamaño movement, fortunately truly democratic in its origins, since none of us sincerely believes that Caamaño is a communist, could be rapidly converted into a communist insurrection; above all it is seen to be heading toward becoming a government of that kind, susceptible of obtaining the support and the assistance of the great Marxist-Leninist powers. Therefore, Mr. President, we do not believe that Colonel Caamaño and his closest advisors are communists. Meanwhile, as the entire Caamaño movement rests upon a truly popular basis, by certain areas escaping from the control of that democratic group of leaders it would be quite possible for that movement to be diverted from its real origins and to follow the oblique plan of popular-based movements, which can be easily controlled by clever agents and experts in the art of transforming democratic popular movements into Marxist-Leninist revolutions. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT. The Representative of Ecuador, Ambassador JÁCOME, has requested the floor.

Mr. JÁCOME (the Special Delegate of Ecuador). I wish to adhere with all sincerity and warmth to the words of the Representative of Mexico, praising the selflessness and the arduous work as well as the spirit of sacrifice with which the Committee performed its functions, and for having succeeded, by the time of its departure, in leaving a somewhat more favorable situation than the one it found upon arrival. Now that we are asking for the opinions of the distinguished colleagues on the Committee, I would like to know if they have any impression as to a formula, or if there is any desire on the part of the two factions to bring about peace by transforming the cease-fire, the truce, into a peace that will permit the political organization of the Dominican Republic and the natural process that should be followed in order to have a constitutionally stable system. It has been gratifying to hear this opinion, at least on one side, that the so-called constitutional government of Colonel Caamaño is certain that it can at a given moment control and capture the infiltrators that are determined to block peace, and, in order to take advantage of that situation, to continue the chaos that has prevailed in Santo Domingo up to now. But if that command hopes to keep and is confident that it can keep control it is natural that whatever the command thinks with regard to the possibility of a formula for stable peace through an understanding with the others—the present enemies—would be very useful and constructive to know because we would then, with a little tenacity, through friendly, fraternal mediation, have a favorable prospect of arriving, within a reasonably short time, at an understanding between the two combatants. This would be the best guarantee that the Americas, as well as the Dominican Republic, could have that those infiltrators and those elements that wish the chaos to continue, would be eliminated and hence definitely neutralized.

I would like to know what opinion the Committee formed, after it succeeded in talking with the parties in conflict, what impression does it have of the opinion or of the formulas or of the hopes they have regarding a final agreement that may return the situation to normal.

The PRESIDENT. Would the Committee like to answer the question raised by the Representative of Ecuador? One of the colleagues on the Committee; the Chairman, Ambassador García Bauer, Ambassador Vázquez Carrizosa, Ambassador Penna Marinho, the Chairman of the Committee, Ambassador Colombo, in his capacity as Representative of Argentina?

Mr. COLOMBO. Perhaps this is the question that I shall answer with the greatest Americanist feeling, Mr. Chairman. I cannot deny, Mr. Ambassador, gentlemen, that I also, like the Ambassador of Mexico, have confessed to him that I shared and still share the concern expressed in his question and that, perhaps, it was the question that caused me the greatest concern. The most urgent problem when we left was not to find ideological banners distinguishing the parties, but to put an end to the conflict that was already becoming bloody and that could become a blood bath in the Americas. We talked with the two parties and believe me, Mr. Chairman, I at first had the feeling that law was dead; it was chaos in the Dominican Republic. We all shared it—all members of the Committee, the military advisers, the General Secretariat, our civilian advisers—and when we arrived we found chaos, such as we had never seen or even imagined. I felt that law did not exist, and we all thought there was little hope that they wanted to find a solution that would be feasible, despite the

moral authority that we represented. We were only a very few, as men, as individuals, but we bore the weight of the historic tradition of the system whose 75th anniversary we celebrated, and this inspired all the members of the Committee. From the first man of the rebel band with whom we spoke Colonel Caamaño, to the first man with whom we spoke from the Command of the Military Junta, Colonel Benoit, we found that they were both weary of the conflict that darkened the Americas. We found in both of them a desire to achieve peace that was equal to ours.

It would be untrue, Mr. President, if I were to say that I found the wish to continue the fight at this stage of the tragedy in the Dominican Republic. There was a longing for peace and we were caught in the enthusiasm to achieve it. But we were completely surprised, Mr. Ambassador, by something more important than this objective which is essentially what we all desire; the two parties said that the solution lay in the Inter-American system. Nobody assumed the right to impose peace because—and let there be no misunderstanding—the side that wishes to triumph in Santo Domingo is stabbing the sister republic. Both factions understood the intensity of the tragedy that was unfolding in Santo Domingo; both placed their faith in the inter-American system.

During the course of conversations, when all members of the Committee asked them if they would be faithful to remaining within the system, they answered yes; with all their faith. But it was more than that, Mr. Ambassador: it was what Colonel Caamaño said, voluntarily. A newsman asked him, "If your cause was denounced in the United Nations, what would you do?" and he confessed to us that he answered that he would in no way accept that channel because he was within the system and the answer had to be found within the system. For that reason he was happy to see the committee sent by the OAS. He placed his faith in the Organization of American States to find the solution. And when we spoke with Colonel Benoit he gave us the same affirmation; his faith is in the system.

I believe that in the midst of the agony of the Dominican Republic, this system that among ourselves we have talked so much of strengthening was more alive than ever and in an hour of testing, in the midst of a struggle more fierce than any I remember within the system, I could see that both sides felt this to be the only possible solution that could maintain peace in the Americas. Both took into account the possibility that it was being compromised: they knew that the peace of the hemisphere might be endangered if the conflict wasn't soon stopped. This, Mr. Ambassador, is what I can tell you, with great satisfaction, and I look to the system for the solution just as all of us are going to look, and you will see that the system will find that solution.

The PRESIDENT. The Representative of Guatemala will contribute to the answer that the Representative of Ecuador has requested.

Mr. GARCÍA BAUER. Mr. President, I wish to add a few words to what the Ambassador of Argentina has said, in reply to the question asked by the Ambassador of Ecuador. I, as a member of the Committee and as Ambassador of Guatemala, confirm the statements made by the Ambassador of Argentina, as to the faith that the inter-American system can help in solving the problem that, so unfortunately, is faced in the Dominican Republic today. Obviously, that country is weary of struggle and would like to arrive at some solution. I, at least, found that there certainly is a basic desire to reach an understanding between the parties and overcome present difficulties. We were surprised, for example, when we began conversations with the Rebel Commander, that a colonel was present who was a liaison officer

between the Military Junta of San Isidro and the Papal Nuncio. And the manner in which he was treated, by Colonel Caamaño as well as the other members of the Rebel Command, surprised us because he was in a group completely opposed to the one he represented. We did not see the hatred that might have been expected in such circumstances. We can bear witness, therefore, to that deference, to the treatment that was shown. Also the Rebel Commander offered to the Committee itself to deliver about 500 prisoners so that it might take charge of them; that is, acts such as these indicate how they wish to end this situation that is dividing the people of the Dominican Republic; from these acts, and from others that we have seen, I have reached the conclusion that at bottom there is a desire, a keen desire to reach an understanding. The question is to find the formula for making this understanding a reality.

The PRESIDENT. Other representatives have asked to speak. I ask the members of the Committee if any of them wishes to join in the reply to the question raised by the Representative of Ecuador. The Representative of Ecuador.

Mr. JÁCOME. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am infinitely grateful for this reply which is truly promising because it has confirmed the suspicion that every human being has who knows the tragedy of a civil war; that those persons who have stained their country with blood and caused so many deaths, who have seen so much suffering and caused so much suffering, would now have reached the moment of longing for peace and perhaps each of them feeling remorse for the sufferings and the misfortunes they have caused. This is an eminently human reaction that we all know. But I am equally satisfied to hear that both parties rest their faith in the Inter-American system, but I have now seen a report, a report concerning the statements made by Colonel Caamaño to the effect that he will not accept the Inter-American Force established by the last resolution of this Meeting of Consultation. We have already seen that it also seems that Colonel Caamaño and his partisans have not accepted the present state of affairs, the presence of foreign troops in Santo Domingo. Hence, would not perhaps Colonel Caamaño, and in the end all Dominicans, whatever their ideologies and whatever the barricade on which they have stood, prefer a mission of peace to a mission of guns? We might think of a permanent peace mission of the Organization of American States, which would receive the same impressions but which would be seeking a concrete formula to bring those parties together who wish to reach an understanding and give them the opportunity of not feeling pressured by arms or not having the inward suspicion that those arms are playing the game of their adversaries. I should like and I venture to put this question to the members of the Committee, and I beg your pardon, as tired and fatigued as you all must be, for still abusing your time with these questions. Thank you very much.

Mr. COLOMBO. I said something, a little circumstantially, in replying to the question posed by the Ambassador of Mexico, regarding this concern that troubles the Ambassador of Ecuador. Here is the most important instance for telling the whole truth, not part of it. And I am going to tell how I saw it. The effort—I said—is mutual and so is the desire to attain peace, Mr. Ambassador, but it is not that I suspect but that I am certain that the two sides in the struggle are not controlling their movement, because the cease-fire was accepted by the fighting groups; but an uncontrollable ingredient conspired against the carrying out of the act of Santo Domingo, an element that history shows does not find a solution by peaceful means and that grows larger when-

May 12, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9983

ever attempts at reaching peace are made, because what will happen, to a great extent, is what happened to us, in parleying for peace, with an absolute cease-fire by the commands so as to talk with the peace mission, but we had to parley for two hours and a half under incessant machine-gun and rifle fire. Who did that? Colonel Caamaño? I think not categorically no.

It is the sniper ingredient, because in a town where arms are handed out to civilians, there can be only two forms of control: either when the civilians lay down their arms and surrender them willingly, or when this is achieved by a force superior to the civilian force. Let all of you ponder the difficult task of imaging a peace attempt, in which we again have the signatures of the two parties, we have the security zone, and the incident is being provoked as a factor breaking out into a tremendous catastrophe. I honestly confess that until now I could not explain how something much worse did not occur. The provocation of the snipers is constant. There are among them, no doubt, the two classes of snipers that there are in such events: those who grab a gun and continue using it with a resentment that no reasoning will lead them to lay it down, and those who continue using it with the resentment of one who cannot control the revolt. That is, these are factors that cannot be controlled by a mission no matter what flag of peace it carries.

The Government of Santo Domingo will not achieve peace until it can be imposed in a climate where conditions in a peaceful Santo Domingo exist for the recovery of institutional normality in the country. Sincerely, Mr. Ambassador, in the choice that you have given me I sacrifice my wish—which is equal to yours—to a realistic concept that one can only appreciate, unfortunately, by having been there. We wished, and we five ambassador who were on the mission mentioned it many times to one another, that all of you could have been there, that not one had been missing, Mr. President. That you could have been at the scene of events to see what we were seeing. In the tremendous confusion, in which it is difficult to find the thread that would open the knot we were trying to untie, where there is political and military confusion, economic disaster, confused people, general anguish, no one can find the ingredient for guidance. I believe, Mr. Ambassador, that it is urgent to seek peace in the Dominican Republic and to tarry as little as possible in discussion, because every hour of discussion is an hour you give to someone who, with good or evil intentions, could still pull the trigger that would prevent the Act of Santo Domingo from being fulfilled. This is my personal impression.

The PRESIDENT. The Representative of Ecuador has nothing more than he wants to say? I recognize the Representative of Uruguay, Ambassador Emilio Oribe.

Mr. ORIBE (the Special Delegate of Uruguay). Mr. President, first of all, I want to adopt the words of the distinguished Ambassadors who have spoken before me in congratulating the Committee on its work and expressing the admiration of my delegation for the way in which they have performed this first part of their task. And so, our warmest congratulations to all of them. Since it is late, Mr. President, I would like to confine myself to some very specific questions. The first of the questions is as follows: for this Meeting of Consultation to be competent to take measures to bring peace and to carry forward the work begun, it is necessary, above all, in the opinion of my Delegation, to ascertain whether the situation in the Dominican Republic is a situation that can endanger the peace and security of the hemisphere. This is the requirement of Article 19 of the Charter for carrying out collective action in matters that normally are

within the domestic jurisdiction of the states. As is known, Article 19 states: "Measures adopted for the maintenance of peace and security in accordance with existing treaties do not constitute a violation of the principles set forth in Articles 15 and 17," which are those that refer to nonintervention. Hence my Delegation believes that a pronouncement must be made by this Meeting of Consultation to the effect that the events in the Dominican Republic constitute a situation that endangers the peace and security of the hemisphere. Departing from that basis, I should like to ask the Committee if it is of the opinion that this is the case, that is to say, that the situation in the Dominican Republic constitutes a threat to the peace and security of the hemisphere. That is the first question.

The second question is as follows, Mr. President: the first part of the task with which the Committee was entrusted has been carried out, and we all congratulate them. We have received a very complete report which will be studied by the delegations and the foreign ministries. There remains, then, the second part of the Committee's task, under the letter b, which reads as follows: "to carry out an investigation of all aspects of the situation in the Dominican Republic that led to the convocation of this Meeting." Naturally, my Delegation understands very well that this cannot be done in one afternoon or one day. However, I should like to ask simply if the Committee believes that there is sufficient evidence to issue a report on this point within a reasonable period of time. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The PRESIDENT. One of the distinguished members of the Committee would like to refer to the first question put by the Representative of Uruguay, Ambassador Vázquez Carrizosa, Representative of Colombia.

Mr. VÁZQUEZ CARRIZOSA (the Special Delegate of Colombia). Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first question is this: Is the situation such that it can endanger peace and security? My reply is yes. Yes, there is a situation that endangers the peace and security. The reasons are very clear. A disturbance or even a guerrilla action in a member state where the elements of order and constituted authorities exist is not the same as in a state where the absence of the state is noted, evaluated, and recorded. What is to be done, Mr. Delegate, in the absence of the state? What does the system do when the state does not exist? What happens when blood is running in the streets? What happens, Mr. Delegate, when an American country—and I am going to speak quite frankly so that you may think about this with all the perspicacity we know you to have—is, under these conditions, in the neighborhood of Cuba? Do we sit on the balcony to watch the end of the tragedy?

Do we all sit down as if we were at a bullfight waiting for the crew to come? What are we to do, Mr. Delegate? We are in a struggle against International Communism; and we are in a world, Mr. Delegate, in which America is not even separated from the other continents even by the ocean. We form part of the world and we form part of the conditions existing in the world. The Dominican Republic, like any other country in the Americas, is a part of the system, and it is the system that will suffer from the lack of a head of state in any of its members. The matter and the problem cannot be expressed in juridical terms, in hermeneutics, needed to fit an act into a lawyer's criterion. The problem is one of deep political meaning, of profound significance, of hemisphere importance much more serious than any of the other American revolutions could be.

There have been many revolutions in America. There have been revolutions in my country; there have been some, I believe, in yours, and I do not believe that a revolution in itself justifies the intervention of the

inter-American system. That has not been my theory; that has not been the theory of my country. However, the acephalous condition of the state constitutes a problem that has occurred on very few occasions. What are we to do, Mr. Delegate when, as the report states, the President of a Junta says: "I cannot maintain order with respect to the diplomatic missions"? And what are we to do, Mr. Delegate, when that Chief presents a note in which he requests the assistance of another country and confesses with the sincerity that we have heard: "Gentlemen of the Special Committee, have the diplomatic representatives asked me for protection and I did not have the elements with which to protect them?" That is the answer to his first question. Now we have the second question: What is happening to the investigation? It is very clear, Mr. Delegate. The complex political events, the multitudinous situations are very difficult to investigate. All of us who have had contact with problems of criminology know about mob psychology: everything that is studied in the classroom, which is very simple, an investigation of a local event, an individual event, let us say.

However, when there are mobs, when they are in the midst of great movements, an investigation can be conducted, investigations must be carried out. But they are obviously difficult investigations. I would spare no effort to support any machinery, agency, or committee that would carry forward that investigation. It would be very desirable. But, of course, such investigations of complex events are not very easy, because many things have happened. Actually, two or three revolutions have taken place. There was the first revolt of colonels. Then there was a revolt of a party; and after that, a revolution of a whole series of guerrilla groups, so that each one may have a different impression of the same event.

I think that, rather than an investigation of the past, what is of interest to the Meeting of Consultation and what is of interest to America is not the investigation of the past, but the investigation of the future. It is the investigation of the future that interests us. The problem is not to stop to fix responsibility, to ascertain who began to shoot first, who entered the National Palace first, who opened the windows, who got out the machinegun, who saw, who heard; all that would be an interminable process that would fill many pages and many records of proceedings. The important thing is not to look backward, but to look ahead.

The PRESIDENT. The Representative of Uruguay.

Mr. ORIBE. I thank Ambassador Vázquez Carrizosa for his remarks. He has told me just what I wanted to know.

The PRESIDENT. The Ambassador of Brazil.

Mr. PENNA MARINHO (the Special Representative of Brazil). Yes, Mr. President. And I also want to say to the Delegates that my reply is also yes. There are two governments, but each one is weaker than the other, completely incapable and powerless to control the situation that prevails in the country. Peace was made on uncertain terms. The Act of Santo Domingo is not a definitive peace; it is a difficult truce, a temporary armistice that may dissolve at any moment. Therefore, the Committee suggests, among the measures that in its judgment might be adopted immediately by the Tenth Meeting of Consultation, the appointment of a technical military group in the city of Santo Domingo to supervise the cease-fire, as well as other measures agreed to by the parties to the Act of Santo Domingo. We must keep watch over that peace and create conditions to prevent the struggle from breaking out again—because it could start again, Mr. President, at any moment. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT. Does any other member of the Committee wish to speak on this ques-

tion? The Chairman of the Committee, Ambassador Colombo.

Mr. COLOMBO. The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that after the words of my distinguished colleagues, the Ambassadors of Brazil and Colombia, there is very little that I might be able to add; but the responsibility involved and the importance of the question, so ably phrased by the Ambassador of Uruguay, compel all of us to make clear our position on this question. When, among the powers and duties, the duty of investigating was decided upon, I cannot conceal the fact that I felt the same as I always feel whenever an investigating committee is named. Generally it investigates nothing; few, indeed, are the investigating or fact-finding committees which, in the parliamentary life of all of our countries, show any fruitful jurisprudence in their results. But this Investigating Committee did have the possibility of good results. And that was because it was aimed at two fundamental objectives that were governing events in the Dominican Republic.

I understood, first, that the investigation was to determine the scope of the danger resulting from the events, which are a matter of concern to the Ambassador of Uruguay. If this was a situation that did not threaten the peace, we would verify that immediately. If the situation was under the control of groups intent on stirring up tension in the Americas, in a struggle in the history of America, which is full of struggle between brothers, in this incorrigible vocation that is periodically written into the history of our countries, that delays the advance of law and democracy, then we would verify it immediately; and we have verified it.

This could be the beginning of a struggle confined to the two well-defined groups. But the presence of those uncontrollable factors, which I urge the Ambassadors to analyze in detail, in the evaluation of facts in order to reach conclusions, they are going to be impressed, as we ourselves were impressed, without seeing them; they have become more dangerous than the groups themselves put together. To my mind, they have become the element that will determine the fate of what is going to be done. If those groups did not exist, and if those responsible for the struggling movements had not confessed that they cannot control them, in view of the existence of a security zone, freely agreed upon by both parties, with a United States military force that is engaged basically in the process of keeping custody over the diplomatic zone, I would also believe, Mr. President, that perhaps we might be able to delimit the process and trust that the peace would not be so obviously jeopardized as it is in this process; because in all revolutions, even a small local one, there is the possibility that there may be the spark of a process that will affect the peace of the Americas.

But the dimensions of this situation, with elements of disturbance on both sides, who are constantly lashing out against the protection offered by the security zone, and in which, Mr. President—and this struck my attention—there is still control to prevent confrontation in a struggle that could technically be called a military struggle; or in other words, there is no military confrontation between the defenders of the zone and the contending groups of the civil struggle. And that struggle is capable of being unloosed, because of the constant harassment by those who are seeking a way to unloose it. Hence, Mr. Ambassador, this matter urgently demands that all of us succeed in finding the way to resolve this situation; that we find the way to dispel the undeniable danger that threatens the peace in this hemisphere, which is the purpose of our organization. Because all of these things are important; economic development, social tranquillity, justice, the progress of the countries; but all of them are built on peace; without peace there is no possibility for the triumph of the inter-

American system. There cannot be the slightest doubt, Mr. President, that the peace of the hemisphere is in grave peril.

But with respect to the second part of the investigation, which is also a matter of anxiety, we have contributed something in the time we had to make our investigation; more than the investigation is the word of the leaders themselves. This act is a confession, and a partisan confession without prior, Mr. Ambassador. It is not a matter of our characterizing the ideology; nobody goes about trying to do that when, actually, it has already been characterized by the leaders of the governments themselves. If necessary, that should be left to the last. I have said at previous sessions: my Delegation is willing; to make and is going to make an exhaustive investigation of the facts, in order to determine the blame according to the action. We shall do nothing to cover up a sharing of responsibility. But in the matter of priorities, investigation has been well placed by the Ambassador of Uruguay. The first thing to be investigated was the projection of the episode, the possibility of its affecting the peace of the hemisphere, the need for urgent action in case it is proved. We five members of the committee shared that opinion when we were there, and we reaffirm it now. The peace of the hemisphere is in such danger, Mr. President, that if the system does not respond to the call of both parties to the struggle, I believe that the peace of the Americas would not be in danger, that peace will be broken. This urgency is shown by the way we have tried to answer the concerns of the Ambassador of Uruguay.

The PRESIDENT. I ask His Excellency the Ambassador of Guatemala if he would like to speak on this point.

Mr. GARCIA BAUER. Mr. President, I would like to add my voice and my opinion to those of my distinguished colleagues on the Committee. I shall also reply, rather emphatically, as was done by the Ambassador of Colombia, that the peace and security are in danger. As was already said, we in the Committee often asked ourselves and commented on the advisability of having all of the members of this Meeting visit the Dominican Republic in order to see, on the scene itself of the events, the situation prevailing in that country: in a state of war, when we arrived, without water, without lights, without telephones, without public services. The lobby of the very hotel where we stayed was a scene of war: children and women sleeping in the lobby itself. The Diplomatic Corps, which met with us, also told us of the serious situation which they had gone through and were going through; anarchy ruled; the attacks that the diplomatic missions themselves had suffered; the wounded, including the diplomatic missions that had given asylum to wounded persons; and this was something that went on hour after hour.

Undoubtedly, peace and security are seriously affected when there is no authority that is respected, for although there are those who proclaim that they represent authority in each sector, it may be seen later that they do not possess it to such a degree that peace prevails; and although they sign documents, such as the cease-fire that was arranged before we arrived, or the Act of Santo Domingo, which we signed; nevertheless, it can be seen that they have no absolute control over the situation when the spectacle of wounded and dead persons is seen. We asked how many had died, how many had been wounded; and I believe that I can say, as an opinion gathered from persons of whom it can be said, insofar as this is possible, that they are better informed on the matter, that at least one thousand five-hundred persons have died in Santo Domingo. And, how are the forces distributed? How is the country? Fighting has taken place so far only in the city of Santo Do-

mingo itself; but who can assure us that it will not spread throughout the country?

The rebel command states that they have maintained peace there, because they have not wished to arouse feelings in the rest of the country; and the military Junta in San Isidro states that they control the rest of the country. What is the real situation? The Committee did not have time to travel through all of the Dominican Republic; but it is evident that chaos exists, that the situation is deteriorating; it changes from one hour to the next; that is clear. The day after we had an interview—under the fire of snipers, as has been said here—with the Constitutional Military Command, the next day, I repeat, the Chief of that Command was proclaimed President of the Republic, Constitutional President; and the Military Junta of San Isidro, which we had talked with and which signed the Act of Santo Domingo, does not now exist, according to reports arriving today through the news agencies. The teletype has just brought, for example, a cable reading: "Domingo Imbert, President of the new Five-Member Junta, quickly convened a press conference and called for a peace-making effort to rebuild the country and restore national unity without discrimination on account of political affiliation." He described Colonel Caamaño as a good personal friend.

The other members of the new Junta are: Julio Postigo, 61 years old, a lawyer whom some people consider a militant in the Revolutionary Party of Juan Bosch; Carlos Crisella Polomey, 51 years old, governor of one of the provinces under the deposed regime of Donald Reid Cabral; Alejandro Seber Copo, 41 years old, an engineer; and Colonel Benoit, a member of the previous Military Junta of three. Imbert did not explain how or why the earlier Junta resigned, or how the new one was formed. Although Caamaño could not be found to give us a statement, the leader of the Revolutionary Party, José Francisco Peña Gómez, stated over the rebel radio that the new group represented an underhanded maneuver against the interests of the Dominican people. In the Dominican Republic we constantly heard rumors, stories that got to us, to the effect that they were inciting to arms over the radio, even during the cease-fire.

The circumstances prevailing in Santo Domingo are most difficult, tremendously difficult; it would be a good thing if the Representatives were to go and see how things are developing there and how, in the report we have submitted, we cannot give an exact picture of the prevailing situation, which has disturbed us deeply. The situation undoubtedly endangers peace and security, and not of the Dominican Republic alone. The Representative of Uruguay also referred to the mission of investigation; and indeed, among the duties entrusted to the Committee was the duty of making an investigation of all aspects of the situation existing in the Dominican Republic that led to the calling of the Meeting. But the kind of investigation that was asked is not one that can be made in a few hours. The Committee had to give priority to what demanded priority, and the first thing was to try to restore peace and conditions of safety, to restore things as much as possible to normal, under prevailing conditions, in order that it could carry out an investigation such as we believed the Meeting of Consultation had requested.

We are in agreement that this investigation should be carried as far as it is desired; but in the short space of time we were there, and with all the tasks we had; and although we sought opinions and points of view on various sides; although we asked all members of the Diplomatic Corps to give us their views in writing, that is, their views on the situation as they saw it; although we asked the disputing groups also to explain to the

May 12, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9985

Committee and to the Meeting what they considered the truth about the Dominican Republic, and also asked the governors of the provinces whom we interviewed to do the same, and did likewise with everyone with whom we had an opportunity to talk and question; although we sought all of the evidence that might serve as a basis for this investigation and to enable the Committee to offer its conclusions to this Meeting of Consultation; despite all this, the time was very short and we cannot give conclusions in the report we have just submitted, not even if we were to be able to change them a little later.

Points of view have been given and information collected, sometimes in personal conversations, as mentioned by the Ambassador of Argentina with respect to his conversation with Colonel Caamaño, or in conversations the members of the Committee had with various persons on the scene; but we should also listen to all parties concerned, to all who want to say something; and such an investigation takes some time. This is the reply we must give to the Ambassador of Uruguay. With respect to this second point, we have done all that we could within the short time available, in an attempt to make the cease-fire effective for the protection of refugees and those who had taken asylum, and so that food distribution could be undertaken, to bring in food, medicines, etc., that can be distributed with the necessary safety. We did a vast amount of work in a very short time, but in regard to investigation, we can say that we have scarcely begun. And despite the little that was seen, the Committee has been able to contribute something in reply to the questions that have been asked here.

The PRESIDENT. I understand that the Representative of Uruguay is very well satisfied with the thorough manner in which the interesting questions put to the members of the Committee have been answered.

Mr. ORIBE. Of course, Mr. President, I would like to express my appreciation once again, and I believe that what has now been said here is fundamental; because the conviction of the members of the Committee will surely allow us, through consultation, to take appropriate measures without getting into the problem of intervention.

The PRESIDENT. I recognize the Special Delegate of Paraguay, Ambassador Yódice. Mr. YÓDICE. Thank you, Mr. President. First, I wish to join in the words of appreciation that have been spoken here to the ambassadors who composed our special committee that traveled to Santo Domingo and completed the great task of which we are so proud. I am very happy that from the first time the floor was requested until now we have had a series of statements from the distinguished ambassadors on the Committee, and their statements make my congratulations even warmer. As the Chairman of the Committee, the illustrious Ambassador of Argentina, Dr. Ricardo Colombo, has said, this is the moment of truth and the Delegation of Paraguay is quite pleased with the action of the members of the Committee.

The Delegation of Paraguay, Mr. President, is proud of this Committee because it has, in the first place, effectively carried out the peacemaking aspect of its mission as fully as is possible; it is proud of this Committee because it has justified the confidence of the Paraguayan Delegation placed in it, inasmuch as the distinguished ambassadors who composed it, whose ability and inter-American spirit all of us know, as was said when the committee's membership was approved, would determine whether or not international communism had a part in the bloody events in the Dominican Republic. If the distinguished Representative of Mexico had not raised the question he did on the matter, I would have done so. I might, however, have put it differently, since I would

not have confined myself to inquiring as to the possibility of Communist intervention in a specific group, but would have extended the inquiry to all aspects of the serious conflict that the Dominican people are undergoing today.

The Government of Paraguay, as I stated clearly when approval was given to the establishment of the collective Inter-American force, believed from the beginning that continental security was at stake. The replies by the Ambassadors composing the Committee reporting today on certain questions regarding these delicate aspects of the Dominican situation have been categorical. My government was right. Continental security is threatened. The danger existed, and still exists, that chaos and anarchy will permit international communism to transform the Dominican Republic into another Cuba. With his customary clarity, courage, and energy, the Ambassador of Colombia, Mr. Alfredo Vázquez Carrizosa, has categorically mentioned the highly political nature of the problem we are facing. In reply to a question of the Ambassador of Uruguay, he has rightly said that the peace of America is threatened, that the security of the hemisphere is threatened, and that there is a possibility that another Cuba, another communist government in the hemisphere will arise out of the chaos and anarchy in the Dominican Republic.

We are proud of the action of our committee, because, as the Ambassador of Uruguay said, it is helping to clarify the problem we are facing. Paraguay had no doubts when it voted on the resolution for the establishment of the Inter-American force. As I said: "The Government of Paraguay approves the sending of U.S. forces to the Dominican Republic, considering that this does not imply armed intervention prejudicial to the right of self-determination of the Dominican people, but, on the contrary, that it is a measure of hemispheric defense against the intervention of Castro-Communist forces. The Government of Paraguay is aware that U.S. armed intervention has been necessary in view of the urgency of preventing extracontinental and Cuban forces and funds from annulling the Dominican people's right of self-determination, since it was evident that it would be difficult for the Inter-American system to act rapidly and energetically. The Government of Paraguay reaffirms its support of the proposed establishment of a hemispheric force and will participate in it if a substantial majority of the governments of the member states do likewise."

Mr. President, if there is anything to regret it is that, for the time being, this valuable, clear explanation of the seriousness of the Dominican problem furnished to us by our committee is known only to the delegates of this Meeting of Consultation.

Obviously we are going to come to a moment when the enlightened judgment of the President and of the Delegates, in my opinion, will decide that these vital conclusions reached by our Committee should be known by all of the Americas, by all of the people of the hemisphere. Because for my Delegation, Mr. President, these conclusions, which appear in the written report and in the replies to the questions posed here, should not be known only by the Delegates; they should be known by all the people. I emphasize this point because I am proud that my Delegation, from the very beginning, has been concerned and has established a position with regard to the seriousness of the conflict, in view of the intervention of international communism in the Dominican events.

Once more, I congratulate the members of our Committee; I am confident that the conclusions they now bring to us from their trip to Santo Domingo and that they will continue to bring will greatly help this Meet-

ing of Consultation. The inter-American system must find the permanent solution referred to by the distinguished Ambassador of Ecuador in order to bring about a return of constitutionality in the sister Dominican Republic, a return of the reign of representative democracy and of human rights, and of all those inalienable principles of sovereign peoples that motivate the resolutions of this Meeting of Consultation in dealing with the Dominican problem. I believe, Mr. President, that with the clarity of the conclusions of the Committee we shall be walking on firmer ground. The basic conclusion that I want drawn from this statement I am now making is that we should act on the basis of these important conclusions furnished to us by the Committee; not only the conclusions appearing in the report that has been distributed, but also those verbally expressed tonight by the members of the Committee. I repeat my congratulations to the ambassadors and my confidence that these highly important conclusions will shortly be brought to the attention of all the Americas. Many thanks, Mr. President.

Mr. TEJERA PARÍS (the Special Delegate of Venezuela). Mr. President, I wish to make a motion.

The PRESIDENT. What is the motion of the Ambassador of Venezuela?

Mr. TEJERA PARÍS. Mr. President, two days ago when it was desired to undertake a thorough analysis of the problem, I asked this distinguished meeting to await the return of the Committee, so that we might question it and hear what proved to be an excellent and highly important report. On behalf of my government, I wish to express appreciation for the work that has been done and the sacrifices that have been made. I now wish to call attention to the following point: perhaps this session should devote itself exclusively to questions and answers, so that by speeding things up we can obtain the information as precisely as possible, leaving basic statements and studies of possible solutions until tomorrow's plenary; otherwise, we shall have to repeat many of the things already said here. This is my motion, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Ambassador, the Chair entirely agrees with you. It would really be interesting to devote ourselves to questioning the honorable Committee and its distinguished members, and the answers that they give us will be very edifying.

Time goes on, and we must take advantage of the privacy of this meeting precisely to present this type of questions and, in this same confidential setting, to obtain the answers of the distinguished Committee members. Naturally, the occasion will come for us to make detailed statements on behalf of our governments on the text of the important report presented by our colleagues on the Committee. I offer the floor to the Representative of Chile.

Mr. MAGNET (the Special Delegate of Chile). Thank you, Mr. President. The opinion that the President has just expressed so wisely is in complete accord with what I am about to say now. Although, for reasons clearly explained at the time, the Delegation of Chile abstained from voting for the establishment of the committee that has now returned to our midst, I can do no less than corroborate, briefly but sincerely, the expressions of praise that the committee has earned. Moreover, the position taken by my country does not inhibit me, for everyone's benefit, from asking some questions that are of interest to my country, and, as I understand, to the others as well. In the Act of Santo Domingo, referred to by the President in his statement, mention is made of a security zone in that city, whose limits would be indicated in a plan appended to this document. Mr. President, I believe that this security zone is a highly important factor in the cease-fire that has been obtained and that a clear delineation

9986

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 12, 1965

tion of this zone and knowledge of it, not just by the parties involved but by everyone, will be very helpful in forming an idea of what might happen if, as may be feared, this security zone were violated. If acceptable to the Committee, I would request, Mr. President, that this plan not only be incorporated into the Act, but also circulated by the secretariat as soon as possible.

The PRESIDENT. I ask; I imagine that the Chairman of the Committee wishes to reply to Ambassador Magnet's question.

Mr. COLOMBO. The Committee, through me, reports that the map is now being distributed, and I apologize to the Ambassador of Chile because it was not attached to the report when this was distributed. The explanation may lie in the undeserved expression of appreciation for the Committee's work, on the part of the Ambassador. Material difficulties prevented distribution, but I now present the map to the Chair so that, as the Ambassador of Chile has wisely requested, it may be distributed as soon as possible, since it is necessary for the proper information of the Ambassadors.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair shall proceed accordingly, Mr. Chairman, Ambassador Colombo.

Mr. MAGNET. I wish to explain that my words did not imply the slightest criticism or reproach of the Committee.

Mr. COLOMBO. I wish to make quite clear that I have not even remotely suspected such an attitude from one whom I know to be a gentleman and distinguished ambassador who honors the inter-American system.

The PRESIDENT. Your second question, Mr. Ambassador.

Mr. MAGNET. It is more than a question, Mr. President, to try to achieve some kind of friendship. I think it is quite clear both from the text and the context of the report we have just had the pleasure of hearing, especially the Act of Santo Domingo—with which we were already acquainted and which is contained in the report signed on May 5—that there is not, nor was there on that date a constituted government in the Dominican Republic able to represent the country, but two parties or conflicting factions. The committee, with the knowledge it gained through its on-the-spot activity, and with its spirit of impartiality, deemed it necessary to hear the two parties or factions in order to reach some useful result. I would like to ask the Chairman of the Committee, through you Mr. President, if the evidence that has been gathered corresponds to the truth.

The PRESIDENT. Shall I refer the question to the Chairman or to the distinguished members of the Committee?

Mr. COLOMBO. I think that, in substance, we have already answered the Ambassador's question. That is, all of us Committee members have confirmed the impression of chaos that we found in the Dominican Republic, the complete lack of authority, the existence of two groups that appeared to be standard-bearers in the conflict and with whom we felt impelled to establish immediate contact. I do not know if this will satisfy the Ambassador, and I wish he would let me know if he has any doubts that I can clear up.

The PRESIDENT. What does the Ambassador of Chile have to say?

Mr. MAGNET. It seems to me that what the Ambassador has said confirms what I—

Mr. COLOMBO. I think it is the same thing, Mr. Ambassador.

The PRESIDENT. Is there any other question? Mr. Ambassador.

Mr. MAGNET. If it is not an imposition on you or on the meeting, Mr. President, I wonder if it would be too much to ask the Committee to tell us how many asylees or refugees still remain in the embassies in Santo Domingo, if it has been able to obtain this information.

Mr. COLOMBO. The truth is that at this time, Mr. Ambassador, it is impossible to

answer your question because, fortunately, the evaluation of asylees has already started. I have information regarding the asylees at my embassy: there were 14 who have already been able to leave. That is, this changes according to the help received, food and other, because the asylees take advantage of arriving planes in order to arrange their transportation; therefore, at this moment it would be practically impossible—because of the time that has elapsed since our arrival—to say how many asylees have been able to leave the country. Fourteen have left my embassy.

The PRESIDENT. Is the Ambassador satisfied?

Mr. MAGNET. I hope I am not being too insistent, Mr. President, but perhaps with the testimony of the other members of the Committee we might obtain an approximate figure, at least.

The SPECIAL DELEGATE OF BRAZIL. Mr. Ambassador of Chile, I wish to inform you that in the Embassy of Brazil there were thirty-eight asylees, of which only six wished to leave the Dominican Republic. The other thirty-two told us that they would prefer to await the return of normal conditions in their country. Therefore, only six asylees in our embassy left the Dominican Republic.

The PRESIDENT. Does Ambassador Vázquez Carrizosa wish to contribute anything?

Mr. VÁZQUEZ CARRIZOSA (the Special Delegate of Colombia). There were about 30 asylees in the Embassy of Colombia in Santo Domingo, some of whom did not wish to leave Dominican territory. Many of them, especially women and children, left on May 5 on the plane that brought in food, medicine and medical equipment.

The PRESIDENT. The Ambassador of Guatemala.

Mr. GARCÍA BAUER. There were 28 asylees at the Embassy of Guatemala, of whom nine left. There are now 19 asylees at present who will be evacuated as soon as possible on the plane arriving from Guatemala with food and medicines. The Secretariat has already been informed of this.

Mr. MAGNET. Mr. President, I wish to leave on record my gratification and to pay public tribute to the patriotism of the Dominicans, since so many of them have chosen not to abandon their country, in spite of the prevailing chaos.

The PRESIDENT. We give the floor to the Representative of El Salvador, Ambassador Clainment Dueñas.

Mr. CLAIMONT DUEÑAS (the Special Delegate of El Salvador). Thank you Mr. President. I am going to ask a question, but I wish at this time to express my government's appreciation for the excellent work of the Committee in the face of the tragic events in the Dominican Republic. Our thanks, gentlemen. The question is as follows, and I wish to refer to the distribution of weapons to the civilian population. I wish to ask the members of the Committee whether they then had sufficient time to investigate how this distribution was made, what was the source, if it is known, whether distribution was made indiscriminately or to persons of any special tendencies, and who were the originators of this distribution. Thank you very much.

The PRESIDENT. I refer the question to the members of the Committee. The Ambassador of Brazil, if you please.

Mr. PENNA MARINHO. Mr. President, I wish to reply to the question posed by the Ambassador of El Salvador, and I do this on previous bases, because the information we received was precarious, and, above all, contradictory. There was, however, a common consensus in these replies, that the arsenal of weapons had been opened, access to it was given to the population, and that the civilian population, a part of which was controlled by Colonel Caamaño, was armed with automatic weapons considered by several authorities we interviewed as the best and most modern existing in the Dominican

Republic. And we were able to ascertain, when we opened negotiations with the group led by the Commander of the Revolutionary Government, Colonel Caamaño, we were able to see various persons, teenagers, women, all armed with machine guns, forming small groups in the streets of the neighborhoods of Santo Domingo that were under the control of the rebels. And so there was a distribution made of all the weapons that were stored in the arsenal of the Dominican Republic to the civilian population that supported Colonel Caamaño's group. This is the information we were able to gather by means of the contacts we had with the various authorities of the Dominican Republic.

The PRESIDENT. Ambassador Vázquez Carrizosa, Special Delegate of Colombia.

Mr. VÁZQUEZ CARRIZOSA. I cannot, of course, give an opinion on the way in which the weapons were distributed, but the truth is that in the sector of the city where Colonel Caamaño's command was located, the presence of weapons, of machine guns, was visible and clear; of all citizens in the streets and of all who were around us, each citizen carried a machine gun, so the weapons were as numerous as the persons who were around us. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT. Does the Ambassador of Guatemala wish to give any opinion in this respect?

Mr. GARCÍA BAUER. Yes, of course it could be seen in the city, as far as we could see, that automatic and other weapons were in the hands of many young civilians, and even of women. Now, according to information I received early Sunday morning, April 25, many young civilians were armed with automatic weapons from the 16 de Agosto Camp.

The PRESIDENT. The Representative of El Salvador, Mr. Clairmont Dueñas.

Mr. CLAIMONT DUEÑAS. Thank you, fellow Delegates. I have a second question, if the President will permit me. I wish to ask the members of the Committee if they have seen, foreseen, or gathered, according to how we use the term, the possibility that the sector controlled by Colonel Caamaño is receiving weapons supplied by another country, not the Dominican Republic—from another country, let us say, Cuba—or is it using the weapons that they have there at this time.

The PRESIDENT. The Representative of Colombia, Ambassador Vázquez Carrizosa.

Mr. VÁZQUEZ CARRIZOSA. There is such a profusion of machineguns in the sector of the city that we visited that in reality the importation of this item is unnecessary.

The PRESIDENT. The representatives who may wish to add something to the reply. The Representative of Venezuela, Ambassador Tejera París, has the floor.

Mr. TEJERA PARÍS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Committee two questions, the first precisely about arms. Did the Committee learn of the existence, or was it able to verify that there is some system of distribution or some inventory whereby, in the forthcoming peacemaking activities, it could check what part of the arms has been returned? My experience in such matters has been that it is possible to have a very large part of the arms given to civilians returned, and then, by a supplementary house-to-house search they can be controlled. In general, the military are very good bureaucrats; they generally make inventories, and so the question I ask is not absurd.

The PRESIDENT. I refer the question to Ambassador Colombo, Chairman of the Committee.

Mr. COLOMBO. Mr. President, the question asked by the distinguished Ambassador of Venezuela I have also asked the various bands or groups in Santo Domingo. All of them were very sorry that they could not provide me with accurate pieces of evidence, which would have been very valuable. When we were about to leave, in connection with the

May 12, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9987

activities reported on in our despatch, our report, the only part on which we obtained a reply that would help allay the Ambassador's fears was given by the United States, when the Ambassador of the United States in Santo Domingo told me that many of those who are arriving in the security zone bring arms with them and turn them in. I tried to go further into this question to ascertain the number of arms. The reply was not definite. I was told merely that this was a report that he had received from General Palmer, who had told the Ambassador of the United States that they had a certain amount of arms that were being turned in by people who were arriving in the zone for diverse reasons, many of whom were coming in search of food or medical care and who were voluntarily turning in their weapons. This is the only thing I can say, but I believe that I have contributed something to allay yours fears, Mr. Ambassador; nothing more.

Mr. TEJERA PARÍS. Thank you very much, Mr. President. The other question would be this: I was very favorably impressed and feel optimistic at the fact that the Committee noted among both the Constitutionalists and the rebels a fervent desire to have the OAS intervene to seek a solution; and that even, according to what I think I heard the Chairman of the Committee say, Colonel Caamaño himself said that he rejected the Security Council solution and preferred an OAS solution, because it belongs to the system. Now I should like to ask you this: Did the Committee explore the possibility, or did it hear of any methodology of any special system, for example, the presence of a high commission of eminent persons or a high commission of good offices that could assist in returning the country to constitutional normalcy now? Does the Committee believe that there would be some possibility that such a solution would be acceptable to all the bands in conflict? I understand that now there is another change in the country.

The PRESIDENT. I refer the question to the Committee members. Mr. Vázquez Carrizosa, please.

Mr. VÁZQUEZ CARRIZOSA. It is still premature to go into that. Of course, we can find evidence of contact, points of common reference, but within an atmosphere of tension and anxiety such as surrounded us, it is difficult right now to think of formulas for a government that might unite the two parts. I do not exclude it as a possibility for the future, but apart from a similar reference to the Organization of American States, I think it is impossible for the Committee (although my colleagues may believe otherwise) to answer that question more precisely. No system came into view. The thing is it was not our job to investigate political conditions of a new government. Our mission, which was precisely set forth by the resolution of May 1, was to obtain a cease-fire, guarantees for the departure of refugees, and safe conditions for the embassies, and also to organize humanitarian aid. Moreover, the terms of the resolution of May 1 did not authorize us to enter into discussions of matters that are the concern of the Dominican people, and personally, my theory is that our mission was essentially to bring about peace—not to prejudge the will of the Dominicans regarding their own future; at least, that is my reasoning.

The PRESIDENT. The floor goes to the Representative of Guatemala, member of the Committee, to reply to certain aspects of the question raised by Mr. Tejera París.

Mr. GARCÍA BAUER. There is no better way to answer the question raised by the Ambassador of Venezuela than to refer him to the terms of reference of the May 1 resolution of this meeting. The work mentioned by the

Representative of Venezuela is not found in the terms of reference, and consequently, the Committee was prohibited from entering into that area. Undoubtedly, and this we have already said, there is a desire for understanding; there is an evident wish for peace, since a number of relationships are involved; there are people, friends of one side and of the other. The Dean of the Diplomatic Corps told us of how, through him, splendid acts of humanitarianism had been performed. People asked him about their friends rumored to be wounded or dead, and he was able to give them explanations and set their minds at rest. In other words, that atmosphere has existed, and if the Ambassador of Venezuela, for example, remembers the cable that I read earlier, it mentioned one of the members of this new junta who described Caamaño as a personal friend, and also mentioned a lawyer, whom some think to be a militant partisan of the revolutionary party of Juan Bosch. In other words, it shows that there is a desire for understanding, that that desire is evident, and, of course, that there is faith in the Inter-American system. How is that desire to be channelled? How can the OAS help to solve that problem that essentially must be solved by the Dominicans themselves? That is something that must be considered at an opportune time by the system, by the organs of the system. I yield the floor to Ambassador Tejera París.

The PRESIDENT. The Special Delegate of Venezuela has the floor.

Mr. TEJERA PARÍS. I first want to explain that my question was not intended as criticism of the Committee, nor did I think that it could have wished to go beyond its terms of reference. I was only referring—perhaps I did not explain myself clearly—to the idea proposed informally by the Delegation of Costa Rica—I don't know if all of you know about this—for setting up a delegated committee, a committee that, by delegation of this conference, would go to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of carrying out the second part of the task of re-establishing peace—that is, the administration of the mechanics of re-establishing peace and a return to institutional normality, not the formation of a government and other such matters. Then I asked myself if such an idea had already occurred to other countries in some form or other, since such ideas are normal. That was my question. Now, I have a third one.

The PRESIDENT. The Chairman of the Committee, Ambassador Colombo, will be so kind as to answer these questions.

Mr. COLOMBO. I want to say a couple of words regarding this concern of the distinguished Ambassador of Venezuela. I share the opinion just expressed by Ambassador García Bauer that our immediate job was to obtain a prompt peace. Also, we were obsessed with the fact—as undoubtedly everyone else was, without exception—that the solution to the Dominican Republic's political problem should be in complete keeping with the principle of self-determination of peoples, and that in the last analysis it was the Dominicans who must determine the direction of their institutional life. For us, it has been enough to know that they respect the jurisdiction and authority of the system and that the system assures the solution. But, Mr. President, with all respect to the Ambassador of Venezuela, neither do I think that this is the time to start discussing these matters, since, precisely for the reasons given by the Ambassador earlier, we should concentrate on the report and on the questions and answers from the Ambassadors and the Committee members respectively.

The PRESIDENT. The Special Delegate of Venezuela has the floor.

Mr. TEJERA PARÍS. I just want some personal information, as all of us do. And another thing. From my own country's experi-

ence, especially during the dictatorship of Pérez Jiménez, communist infiltration is generally chaotic everywhere and tries to produce chaos in the various factions. Experience shows us that it is much easier and more common for communists to ally themselves with elements of the extreme right than with liberal ones. And so I ask whether the Committee noted or inquired as to the presence of agents and provocateurs on the side of Benito, Wessin y Wessin, and company, or whether they investigated the presence of communists from the other side, because some of their actions seem—give the impression of being—provocations rather than judicious acts.

The PRESIDENT. Would the Chairman of the Committee like to say something in this regard?

Mr. COLOMBO. Thank you, yes. That also is a very pertinent question, and I think that we answered it to a certain extent when we acknowledged the existence of snipers on both sides. That is, there are snipers everywhere; they are a general disturbing element throughout the country, although we cannot attribute to them the particular ideology mentioned by the Ambassador. But it is apparent that anyone who plays the part of a sniper and has escaped the normal command of either of two groups is following his own ideology. That is all, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT. Would Ambassador Penna Marinho like to comment on the question presented by Ambassador Tejera París? Ambassador Vásquez Carrizosa? Ambassador Bauer? Would you like to, Mr. Ambassador?

Mr. VÁZQUEZ CARRIZOSA. Well, I just have this thought: if there are snipers in both parties, why can't they be snipers of the Wessin communists, or snipers of the Caamaño rightists, or simply nationalists?

The PRESIDENT. Is there any comment on these last statements, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. COLOMBO. I should not like to continue this dialogue because that would lead us into a maze of conjectures, Mr. Ambassador, but I believe, and I will say, that there is a fundamental difference: Colonel Caamaño's commands recognized the existence of Communist elements that were seeking to infiltrate and to gain control of his movement—an affirmation that I did not hear, nor do I believe that any of the members heard it, from Colonel Benito.

Mr. TEJERA PARÍS. Maybe they are not so politically sensitive.

The PRESIDENT. Well, reportedly so, according to some opinions.

Mr. TEJERA PARÍS. I thought as much, but I just wanted to make sure. Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador.

The PRESIDENT. Our thanks go to you, Mr. Ambassador. We shall now hear from the Ambassador of the United States, Mr. Bunker.

Mr. BUNKER. I would like to express on behalf of my delegation, and indeed on behalf of my Government, appreciation and praise to all of the members of the Committee of the Meeting, individually and collectively, who, under the brilliant leadership of my friend and colleague, Ambassador Colombo, have accomplished so much in so brief a period, and under, as they have described to us, the most difficult and trying circumstances. We have heard the report of the Committee this evening, and I am confident that this Meeting will agree with me, that the Act of Santo Domingo marks an outstanding achievement in what has been our priority objective under the terms of the resolution, an agreement on an effective cease-fire in the Dominican Republic. As Ambassador Colombo has reported, the Secretary of State has communicated to the Committee that the United States supports its work in Santo Domingo, and pledges to cooperate fully in the observance of the provisions of the Act of Santo Domingo.

Mr. COLOMBO. Mr. President, something has gone wrong with the interpreting equipment, because I heard the English spoken by the Ambassador much more loudly than the Spanish interpreter to whom I was listening.

The PRESIDENT. Is the Ambassador's speaker turned too high?

Mr. BUNKER. Shall I proceed? Well, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that the questions which have been put by my distinguished colleague to the Committee, and the answers of the members, have shed further light and have made a very great contribution toward a greater understanding of the situation existing in the Dominican Republic; a contribution so valuable that I think it should become public knowledge, Mr. Chairman. I believe that it was agreed at our previous meeting that the proceedings of the private meetings and the records would become public. I trust that that will be so in this case, because I think the record is extremely valuable to provide a much wider public knowledge of the actual conditions in the Dominican Republic.

The Committee has succeeded in taking this first step of major importance. It seems to me that this meeting can now move to a second major stage of the task, for I think we can all agree that much remains to be done before conditions return to normal in that tragic and torn country. It is quite obvious, from what the Committee has said, that there is today no effective national government in the Dominican Republic. There are contending forces, each in control or perhaps quasi-control in separate areas, but no political grouping or faction can lay a well-founded claim to being the government of the country. I say quasi-control because we had word from our Embassy in Santo Domingo today that the palace inside the rebel zone, in which 400 people, I believe, have taken refuge, had been attacked three times during the day. This may be indeed a violation of the cease-fire.

But it remains, Mr. Chairman, for the Dominican people, with the help of the OAS to which I understand they are looking, from the words of the Committee, to organize a government and to provide for future constitutional arrangements of their own choosing. It seems to me that it is of the greatest importance that the OAS should endeavor to assist patriotic and outstanding citizens of the Dominican Republic, and I am sure they can be found, to establish a provisional government of national unity, which could eventually lead to a permanent representative regime through democratic processes.

Mr. Chairman, we must now seek to find paths of peace and to build on the base which has been established by this act of Santo Domingo. I want again to express the appreciation of my Government for the splendid work of this Committee because they have established, through what they have done here, really the first and essential base for any further progress. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The PRESIDENT. I recognize the Representative of Uruguay, Ambassador Oribe.

Mr. ORIBE. Mr. President, I would like to second what the Ambassador of the United States has said with regard to making the minutes of this session public. I do this with the understanding, naturally, that they will be published as is usual; that is, that they will be complete, verbatim minutes. Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT. It is so agreed. Ambassador Facio, Special Delegate of Costa Rica.

Mr. FACIO. First, I would like to join in the congratulations given to the distinguished members of the Special Committee for their splendid work. Second, the question I am going to ask is to clarify a concern I have with respect to the possibility of securing an effective peace in the Dominican Republic. I wish to ask the members of the Committee if they interviewed Col. Caamaño

or any members of his group after that band was established as what they allege to be the Constitutional Government of the Dominican Republic?

Mr. COLOMBO. The value of the Act of Santo Domingo is precisely that it was signed after the establishment of Colonel Caamaño's group as the titular Constitutional Government nothing more.

Mr. FACIO. Then, you had the opportunity to discuss with them their claim to be the only constitutional government of the Dominican Republic, because whether or not this claim can be maintained in either relative or absolute terms depends on there being peace through mediation between the two groups.

The PRESIDENT. The Chair again recognizes the Ambassador of Argentina.

Mr. COLOMBO. Mr. President, replying to the important question asked by the Ambassador of Costa Rica, I am pleased to tell him that the Committee delivered the Act previously to Colonel Caamaño for consideration, in order that he would have the opportunity of going into the intricacies of its legal implications, because what we wishes to achieve was the first step that would lead all of us to achieve peace in the Dominican Republic, and if you read the beginning of the Act of Santo Domingo, it sets forth what Colonel Caamaño and Colonel Guerra thought of the Act and the opinion of the parties. I recall simply that it reads: "The Parties signing below who declare that they represent, in the capacities mentioned," that is, in the act of signing they declared their capacity and as we had no authority to pass judgment on the titles, which would have implied a dangerous incursion into a territory that was forbidden to us, we limited ourselves to record the capacity of each one of the groups and with all loyalty to say to frankly and without any legal doubt at the beginning of that Act which would, undoubtedly, be the road to begin working seriously to bring definitive peace to Santo Domingo.

The PRESIDENT. Ambassador Facio wishes to ask at other question.

Mr. FACIO. Many thanks. No, I am satisfied and, of course, the question did not imply any criticism whatsoever or any desire that they depart from that norm.

The PRESIDENT. Ambassador Vázquez Carrizosa, the Special Delegate of Colombia.

Mr. VÁZQUEZ CARRIZOSA. The Ambassador of Costa Rica asks whether the constitutional government invokes the qualification of government for the whole country and whether it authorizes the presence of another government.

Mr. FACIO. No. Naturally it is evident that each one of the parties which proclaims that it is the government aspires to this, but did you, specifically from this contact, reach the conclusion that Colonel Caamaño was in an irreducible position; not to yield. And I ask this question because after the signing of the Act of Santo Domingo, Caamaño has insisted that he does not accept the participation of an inter-American force and that the solution is that he is the President, and that he be recognized as Constitutional President, and that he represents legality.

Mr. COLOMBO. First of all, Mr. Ambassador, I would like to know whether this statement by Colonel Caamaño has been officially communicated.

Mr. FACIO. No, it is a publication.

Mr. COLOMBO. That is why I was very surprised that Colonel Caamaño transmitted that note.

Mr. FACIO. No, no, Doctor, it is a statement made in a newspaper.

Mr. COLOMBO. If we follow the newspapers in this process, Mr. Ambassador.

The PRESIDENT. The Representative of Honduras,

Mr. VÁZQUEZ CARRIZOSA. What the newspapers say is one thing and what really happens is another, but it should be noted that

many news items that are published should be investigated or it should be known to what extent they correspond to what was said or to what is done. I can only say the following: the demarcation of the zone and the existence of a corridor communicating the San Isidro zone with the center of the city were discussed personally with Colonel Caamaño. There was even a doubt regarding the conditions of the guard in the corridor. An incident had occurred the day before—many incidents occur—regarding some patrol that had entered farther than the two blocks that on one side and the other were authorized by the regulations in order to safeguard this public road; and Doctor Héctor Aristides maintained that it was intolerable that United States patrols should go beyond the limits. The military adviser who accompanied us—he was the military adviser of the Ambassador of Guatemala—who had had the occasion to read the regulations and the truth regarding the incident, explained in perfectly fair terms the truth of the fact, rectifying Doctor Aristides' understanding, but as Doctor Aristides insisted, Colonel Caamaño intervened, with some vigor, to say "no, this is something between the military and we understand one another. I believe that what the military adviser says is true; I believe that it is acceptable; I have no objection." I am stating this fact in case it clears up your doubts.

The PRESIDENT. The Special Delegate of Guatemala, Mr. García Bauer.

Mr. GARCÍA BAUER. I only wished to mention, with regard to something that has been discussed before, especially by the Ambassador of Costa Rica and also with respect to a question that was asked before, that in Document 17 Add. 3, in which the fourth radio-telephone message of the Secretary General of the OAS, Doctor José A. Mora, reports—you all have the document before you—that the Military Junta has already traveled to Santo Domingo and is installed in the National Congress, it states, Center of the Heroes, then—

The PRESIDENT. Of the Military Junta that traveled to Santo Domingo? The fifth or the—

Mr. GARCÍA BAUER. Yes, the Military Junta that was in San Isidro. It doesn't say here whether it was the five-man Junta or the three-man Junta, because I don't know if it was done before the five-man one was established, and then, in today's May 7 document, it says: "as to what is happening here, the situation continues to be very delicate, since the cease-fire agreement is being enforced with great difficulty. It is particularly affected by radio broadcasts that confuse and excite the population. Every effort is being made to stop the Santo Domingo station from issuing messages that excite the people. If this is achieved it would prevent a state of violence." The same is true with respect to the San Isidro Radio. Yesterday I went to the two broadcasting stations and transmitted a message intended to calm feelings and calling upon the Dominican people to comply with the agreements in the Act of Santo Domingo. Nevertheless, Radio Santo Domingo and Radio San Isidro continue sending messages that aid in inflaming spirits and maintaining the situation of violence." And this same document mentions the asylees who have left and gives up-to-the-minute information regarding them. This is important in relation to the questions that we were asked previously.

The PRESIDENT. Thank you very much. Is Ambassador Facio satisfied?

Mr. FACIO. Thank you very much.

The PRESIDENT. The Representative of Honduras, Ambassador Midence.

Mr. MIDENCE. My delegation wishes to join in the congratulations extended to the Committee for its magnificent work under such difficult circumstances. My Delegation feels

ay 12, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

sure that the report that has been presented today will be of immense value to this Tenth Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs. Thank you very much.

The PRESIDENT. Ambassador Bonilla Atiles, Special Delegate of the Dominican Republic.

Mr. BONILLA ATILES. Mr. President, Delegates: I think that of all the delegates present here none can feel the pain that I have at what I have heard tonight. Words were too few to express my appreciation to the members of the Committee. I have just had a long-distance telephone conversation, from Santo Domingo, with Mr. Antonio Imbert, and he told me that in a search for possible solutions the Military Junta had turned its power over to a civilian-military junta composed of: Antonio Imbert, president; Julio Ortiz, Alejandro Seller, Carlos Grisolia Poloné, and Colonel Pedro Benoit. This junta will try to cooperate with the mission from the Organization of American States to find solutions, which are still premature to discuss. He also informed me that the Junta has discussed with Dr. Mora the problem of the radio broadcasts, and it has been proved that Radio San Isidro has not made any inflammatory broadcasts. As to the last attack on the National Palace, of which Ambassador Bunker spoke, he confirmed to me that there are civilian refugees there.

I am not mentioning this as accusation but as fact. What interests me most at the moment, since it involves my own responsibility and that of the government, whichever it may be, and that of the Dominican people, is that out of this meeting shall come the necessary and imperative declaration that what is happening in Santo Domingo threatens the peace of the hemisphere. After knowing the facts, this is the only justification this body has for having taken the steps that it has. I do not propose that this problem be dealt with or discussed tonight because it seems to me that we are all sufficiently tired, morally and physically, so as to be unable to face this problem immediately; but I do urge the Tenth Meeting of Consultation as soon as possible to make emphatically this decision, so that the fire will not be extinguished, not only in the Western hemisphere but in all political quarters of the world. I have nothing more to say.

Mr. PENNA MARINHO. Mr. President, before ending this session and to a certain extent supplementing the report of the Special Committee, which has just been submitted by its Chairman, Ambassador Ricardo Colombo, allow me to mention one point that ought to be brought to the attention of this Meeting of Consultation. I wish to refer to the magnificent activities of Monsignor Emmanuel Clarizio, the Papal Nuncio in Santo Domingo. He is an exceptional figure, a veritable Don Camilo on a grand scale, with free entrée into all political areas of Santo Domingo. With astonishing ease, he leaves the headquarters of Colonel Caamaño to go to the Government Junta and from there to the American Embassy. He is a respected friend of Caamaño, as he is of Benoit and of Ambassador Bennett. They all like him and they all have the same high regard for him. It is due to his thorough understanding of things, to his moving spirit of human solidarity and to his profound love for the Dominican people, that the drama in that country did not assume more terrible proportions. I know that the Meeting of Consultation has already paid just tribute to Monsignor Emmanuel Clarizio, but it never will be too much to point out, for the eternal gratitude of America, the admirable labor of this extraordinary prelate in behalf of peace and tranquillity in the troubled Dominican Republic. The Delegation of Brazil, expressing sentiments that I know are those of all the Special Committee of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation, manifests its deep appreciation and above all its admiration for the continuous and tireless collaboration

rendered by Monsignor Emmanuel Clarizio, Papal Nuncio in Santo Domingo, to the Special Committee of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation during its stay in the Dominican Republic. Thank you very much.

The PRESIDENT. Ambassador Ricardo Colombo has the floor.

Mr. COLOMBO. Mr. President, with deep feeling the Delegation of Argentina wishes to add to the words of the Ambassador of Brazil concerning the outstanding work of the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, that messenger of peace in the Dominican Republic. The only tribute—because everything has already been said—that I can pay under the circumstances, is to repeat here, Mr. Chairman, before the entire meeting, his final words of good-bye to us: Take—he said to me—my blessing to the Meeting of Foreign Ministers that they may achieve the high objectives of peace; the peace that, at all costs, must be preserved in this Republic where I hold this apostleship. Nothing more, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT. Ambassador Vázquez Carrizosa, Special Delegate of Colombia, has the floor.

Mr. VÁZQUEZ CARRIZOSA. Mr. President, it is only right to say a few words, as my colleagues from Brazil and Argentina have already done, to emphasize the merits of the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, the Papal Nuncio, in the face of such a difficult situation. There is more; none of our action would have been possible without the advice, without the help of that eminent diplomatic representative. And still more, for the future—for it would be very difficult to think about the future of the Dominican Republic without speaking of him who so perfectly represents the ideal of Pope John XXIII concerning the coexistence of men of good will. But I have asked for the floor to speak on a point which may not be appropriate at this time but would be at another. Our report ends with several recommendations, which I do not propose to discuss at this session, but I do want to point them out, to the Chairman so that at the time and in the way provided for in the regulations or when it is considered opportune, they may be submitted to the Tenth Meeting of Consultation for discussion, because they do not deal with political questions, such as those we have discussed intensely, but specific points on the future organization of activities in the Dominican Republic. They are specific points of the greatest urgency, such as supervision of the cease-fire, the appointment of a group qualified to organize the relief measures for the Dominican people and evaluate their needs, the study and planning of an Inter-American Force and the coordination of all its services. Detailed, careful, and immediate consideration of these points seems to me absolutely necessary. Thank you very much.

The PRESIDENT. The Special Delegate of Guatemala, member of the Committee, has the floor.

Mr. GARCÍA BAUER. At this time I only wish to refer to the tribute that my colleagues, the members of the Committee, have already paid to the Papal Nuncio and Dean of the Diplomatic Corps in Santo Domingo, Monsignor Emmanuel Clarizio, for the great work that he has performed since this grave conflict began in the Dominican Republic. The Papal Nuncio was exceptionally kind to the Committee, offering it every facility within his power, and it was through his great services that the Committee was able to accomplish what it did. He was present, tirelessly, at our interviews with Colonel Caamaño's command and with the Military Junta and, because the confidence both parties have in him, the Act of Santo Domingo was signed. He always used persuasion to the effect that the purposes for which the Organization of American States was in Dominican territory should be borne in mind. As the Ambassador of Brazil has said, the Papal Nuncio was

respected in every area, regardless of which authority was in power. He is a person who has the confidence of the different parties and through his good offices, because of the great collaboration he rendered, the Committee was able to accomplish its task. Hence the Committee was moved and felt that its own wishes were fulfilled when, at the Papal Nunciature in Santo Domingo, we delivered to the Dean of the Diplomatic Corps the message from the President of the Tenth Meeting, Mr. Sevilla Sacasa, notifying him of the action of this Meeting some days ago concerning Monsignor Clarizio's work.

The PRESIDENT. Ambassador Colombo, Special Delegate of Argentina has the floor.

Mr. COLOMBO. I only wish to add one remark that seems to be strictly justifiable. In order to be able to act with the urgency that the case requires, the five-member Committee had to move up its return so that the Tenth Meeting could be as thoroughly informed as possible with all available data, but we were deeply concerned that before our departure the fundamental problem of the faith in the system as stated by the two sides in the struggle would not have been resolved, and the Committee was the link, at the scene of action, during the emergency, remaining in order to be able to carry out the powers accepted by both parties. It was for this reason that the Delegate of Panama, in an act that honors him, and which I cannot ignore, remained at the center of action, representing our mission. In this way, according to the conversations we held with the parties, it would be as though the Committee were present and together with military advisers and the civilian personnel he could undertake to solve whatever it might be possible to solve, to the extent that we are able—to solve the difficulties arising from the events that have taken place and that are taking place in the Dominican Republic. I want this generous act of the Delegate of Panama, from a country that has so many reasons for counting on the tradition of brotherliness in solving basic problems, to be recognized at this session. Panama is with us on the Committee, represented by its distinguished Delegate. Ambassador Calamari also wanted to be here, physically, with the Committee but was not able to do so. I want to stress this act of the Delegate of Panama because it is eminently fair to do so—to take note of one who has firmly carried the banner of the inter-American system into the midst of the fight. Nothing more.

The PRESIDENT. We are sure that our colleague, Ambassador Calamari, must be gratified by the eulogy given by his compatriot and our dear colleague, Ambassador Frank Morrice. [Sic]

Ambassador Diez de Medina, Special Delegate of Bolivia, has asked for the floor; and then Ambassador Tejera Paris, Special Delegate of Venezuela.

Mr. DIEZ DE MEDINA. Mr. Chairman, I have not asked for the floor to pose any question; I have no questions to ask. I have only words of praise—of warm praise and congratulations—for the distinguished members of the Special Committee of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation, for the intelligent and devoted manner in which they carried out the delicate mission entrusted to the Committee. I only wish, Mr. President, to add my wish that the minutes of this plenary session should also include words of congratulation and appreciation for the task being so successfully performed in the Dominican Republic by Dr. José Antonio Mora, Secretary General of the Organization of American States. Thank you very much.

The PRESIDENT. Very well, we shall do so. Ambassador Colombo, the Special Delegate of Argentina has the floor.

Mr. COLOMBO. The Ambassador of Bolivia is quite right in proposing formal recognition of the fact that the Committee was able to fulfill its mission because of the brilliant

9990

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 12, 1967

efforts that were begun by Dr. José A. Mora before our arrival in the Dominican Republic. Appreciation should also be expressed to the Secretariat, which, although few in number gave much in efforts and efficiently contributed to the success of our actions. Therefore, I second the Ambassador of Bolivia's proposal but would like to point out that we had intended to submit this matter during the session.

The PRESIDENT. The Ambassador of Bolivia and the Committee have interpreted the feelings and thoughts of the Chair and of all our colleagues very well. Ambassador Tejera París, Special Delegate of Venezuela has the floor.

Mr. TEJERA PARÍS. The Delegate of Bolivia anticipated what I was thinking and what is certainly the thought of all of us here. My intention was I now confirm it, to ask the chair to ask this Tenth Meeting of Consultation to give to the Committee, to the Secretary General, and to the members of the General Secretariat a vote of applause for the work they have done. The test that the Committee has passed has been hard both there and here, and I believe that since this is a problem that affects the whole security of the hemisphere, these colleagues deserve not only our thanks but the thanks of our governments and of their peoples, and, at this moment, enthusiastic applause which I am sure the President will be the first to begin. [Applause.]

The PRESIDENT. All of us join in the praise and tribute the Special Committee has given to the prelate Emmanuel Clarizio, Papal Nuncio in the Dominican Republic and Dean of the Diplomatic Corps in Santo Domingo. We share in this with real appreciation, with affection, as our common duty. His services for the peace of the Americas, his vows and his blessings we applaud with emotion; with emotion, I say, which corresponds to the emotion that he experienced when he received our expression of deep gratitude for his magnificent labor for the peace of the Americas and for that people that we all love so well: the Dominican Republic. This closed plenary session has been highly important. We have heard the interesting report of the Special Committee. We have posed broad questions; we have obtained splendid and very clear replies, from which we can appreciate even more the extraordinary task accomplished by the Committee. Our repeated applause and eulogy for it and its members, all of whom we are honored to call our colleagues and friends. Unless you think otherwise a plenary session of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation should be indicated to consider the report in the aspects noted by the Committee, so that the meeting may act on that report. We have asked questions and have obtained answers; now comes the job of considering the report and analyzing the action to be taken by the Tenth Meeting of Consultation on the recommendations proposed by the Special Committee and the conclusions that it reached.

I ask you only whether tomorrow's plenary session should be open—I understand that it should be. It should be open so that the public will know everything that we have said, both with respect to the work of the Committee and to the contents of its interesting report. I would call another closed meeting, if the Committee so wishes, but the meeting I am going to convoke for a little later today, should be public and its purpose will be to consider the report of the Special Committee, discuss it and propose decisions concerning the recommendations it makes. The delegates have already seen and have in your briefcases for later reading the fourth radio-telephone message from our Secretary General, Dr. Mora.² It is not necessary

to have the Secretary read it, since I am sure all of you have read it. With respect to the minutes of this plenary session, I ask you to take note that you have 24 hours in which to give the Secretariat your corrections of style. I ask you to take note of that time period so that the Secretariat can speed up the final edition of the minutes of the plenary session.

Mr. COLOMBO. Mr. President, I should like you to repeat the last part as to the time and place, according to the Chair's plan, as was suggested. Please do me the great favor of repeating it.

The PRESIDENT. Yes, sir. We are going to adjourn the session and meet again in a few hours, let's say, perhaps this afternoon. It will be a plenary session of the Tenth Meeting, public, for the purpose of considering the report of the Special Committee. To consider it, analyze it, discuss it, and decide on the recommendations and conclusions reached by the Committee. It is assumed that this session should be public. The next plenary session will not be closed like this one; it will be public, so that public opinion of the hemisphere will be informed, but not just of what is in the report of the Special Committee, because I am hereby suggesting that the report should be made public, unless for some reason the members of the Committee indicate to the Chair that it should not be made public but that we ought to wait until tomorrow's session.

Mr. COLOMBO. Absolutely, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT. Therefore, gentlemen, as of now the report of the Special Committee is public. Consequently, it can be turned over to the press and sent to anyone wishing it. Naturally, if at tomorrow's meeting we reach conclusions on the suggestions made by the Committee, we shall feel highly gratified. In any case I think that the time has come for the Meeting of Consultation to make concrete statements on the chaotic situation that seems to grow worse every hour. Therefore, within 5 or 6 hours, possibly for 4 or 5 o'clock this afternoon, I am going to convene the fifth plenary session of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation to meet in this same place and take up the report of the Committee. The Representative of Venezuela.

Mr. TEJERA PARÍS. Mr. President, only to ask if you would be good enough to include in the order of business two specific points that I believe are relevant to the announcement you have just made: first would be consideration of whether or not the present situation in the Dominican Republic affects the security of the hemisphere; second, establishment and implementation of measures to help the Dominican people return to full constitutional democracy.

The PRESIDENT. Very well; it seems to me there is no objection to discussing these two points in the public session we shall hold shortly—the one suggested by the distinguished Representative of Uruguay and supported by the Representative of Venezuela, and the other just mentioned by the distinguished Ambassador Tejera París. I recognize the Representative of the Dominican Republic.

Mr. BONILLA ATILES. Mr. President, I shall wait until tomorrow to formally present a draft resolution on my proposal that the Organ of Consultation declare the situation in the Dominican Republic to be a threat to the peace of the hemisphere.

The PRESIDENT. Very well. The Representative of Paraguay has requested the floor.

Mr. YÓDICE. I only wish to ask two questions, Mr. President. I understand, or rather, I actually heard you mention a decision on the request of the Delegate of the United States that the minutes of today's session be made public. This request was seconded by the distinguished Representative of Uruguay. From this I assume, that is, I hope, because the suggestion is also mine, that it will be agreed to make public the minutes of this session.

The PRESIDENT. The chair has so resolved. Mr. YÓDICE. I beg your pardon. Thank you. The PRESIDENT. That's quite alright.

Mr. YÓDICE. Now, I have another question to ask of the distinguished Representative of Costa Rica, arising from an earlier statement by the Ambassador of Venezuela, because it refers to the matter of considering measures to bring democratic normality to the Dominican Republic, and during this Tenth Meeting of Consultation, I don't recall having heard any informal proposal by the distinguished Ambassador Facio regarding the establishment, as the distinguished Ambassador of Guatemala said, of a committee of statesmen, or something similar. Therefore, I would like to ask if Ambassador Facio did or did not make such an informal proposal, because I would not want to fail to inform my foreign ministry of something that had been proposed here. Thank you.

The PRESIDENT. Thank you. The Delegate of Costa Rica.

Mr. FACIO. Mr. Representative of Paraguay, I have not yet made any proposal of this sort. Perhaps it can be clarified in this way: there has been some discussion of a proposal, but not one of mine, to put some of the recommendations of the Committee into effect. I shall be very happy to give you a copy at the end of this session. But the proposal was not made by Costa Rica; it has been discussed among several delegations but is nothing specific.

Mr. YÓDICE. I understand. Thank you. I wanted to know if it was proposed here.

The PRESIDENT. Ambassador Tejera París.

Mr. TEJERA PARÍS. I would like to ask the Committee on Credentials if it would be possible to have a meeting early tomorrow to re-examine all our credentials, because it appears there are certain doubts that should be clarified in the light of the information transmitted in the cable that the Ambassador of the Dominican Republic reported on a short time ago.

The PRESIDENT. Ambassador JÁCOME, the Representative of Ecuador.

Mr. JÁCOME. As Chairman of the Committee on Credentials I can report that I have called a meeting of the Committee for tomorrow at 8:30 p.m. Any representative who has any doubt as to himself or to his colleagues may present his complaints to the Committee.

The PRESIDENT. Gentlemen, we have taken note of the announcement just made by our colleague, the Chairman of the Committee on Credentials, and it is now the time to adjourn the session and to announce that the fifth plenary session of the Tenth Meeting of Consultation will be held here this afternoon at 4 p.m. The session is adjourned.

VIRGINIA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AWARDS DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD TO SENATOR ROBERTSON

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I commend the members of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce on the excellent judgment they displayed in selecting our distinguished colleague, Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, to receive the chamber's Distinguished Service Award.

The award was presented to our esteemed friend and colleague, Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON, at a banquet in Williamsburg last night, ending the 41st annual meeting of the State chamber.

Many well-known persons have received this award, but I feel sure none of them had worked any harder for the welfare of Virginia and its people than the Senator who was chosen for the honor this year.

² The complete text of the fourth message of the Secretary General is published as Document 17 Add. 3.

May 12, 1965

Carry me in regalia of bygone days
Plumed by the morning breath of Appaloosas,
Across the meadow of the camas,
Through satin dew upon Wallowa's shadow,
There leave me far away.
I'll drum.
I'll sing.

Hold me without bruising, as in embrace,
Carpeted on the palms of loving hands.
Move through the camps from west to east,
For my sun rises, does not set,
And lifts me far away.
I'll drum.
I'll sing.

Mail Service Getting Worse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD the statement of Jerome Keating, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, in which he points out that the mail service is the worst he has seen in 15 years and is getting worse. He also indicated that one reason is "reduced railway post office operations."

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, the Postal Department is planning to remove the mail car from trains Nos. 42 and 43 of the Burlington Railroad between Alliance, Nebr., and Billings, Mont. If this is permitted it will mean the mail service in the four Western States will get even worse, even though making the mail service worse is almost unbelievable:

Question. Mr. Keating, just how bad is mail service these days?

Answer. It's the worst I've ever seen and I've been associated with the letter carriers for 42 years. It gets worse every year.

Question. Can you give some specifics?

Answer. Yes. Service has been cut all along the line. The postal service has steadily consolidated post offices, reduced railway post office operations, and cut money order and postal savings facilities. Twice-daily deliveries now are reduced to one. Parcel post deliveries are down to five from six per week. I have here on my desk the wrapping from a package mailed from Lower Manhattan to a point on Long Island on January 4. It did not arrive until the 14th. Ten days to travel just a few miles. Another package, mailed from Washington, D.C., last January 13, arrived at its destination in Des Moines on January 25. In Greenville, S.C., church bulletins mailed on a Monday did not arrive until the following Monday or Tuesday, thereby leaving members uninformed about the Sunday services. All were for local delivery. In Madisonville, Ky., beauty parlors' supplies, shipped parcel post by train from nearby Nashville, took nearly a week. In sheer exasperation, the owners switched to a commercial delivery service.

Question. Speaking of parcel post, why are so many packages smashed in the mails?

Answer. Largely because of electronic sorting equipment. At the main post office in Washington, D.C., 14 employees are kept busy rewrapping broken packages. Recently, the St. Paul Post Office was smashing 25 hampers of packages daily. When this forced them to return to human labor, the rate dropped to one hamper per day.

Question. What's behind all these shortcomings in the mail service these days?

Answer. Lack of manpower, primarily. Reduced use of railroads is another reason. The post office now has taken the position that sorting of mail in transit, as done in the railway mail cars, is no longer necessary. All of this means not only poor service, but more and more overtime. Some postal workers now spend 80 hours a week on the job. That is a waste of money, because a man cannot work efficiently that long.

Question. That brings up the question of postal employee morale. What's the picture there?

Answer. It could hardly be worse. Postal employees are trying to do a job they cannot do because there are not enough of them. But, of course, they get the blame for poor service. Employees are being worked to their physical limits and are suffering in many ways. In the Atlanta region, there were 55,840 hours of work lost over seven pay periods. Many accidents were due to physical and mental exhaustion. Employees in the Denver post office have been requested to cancel annual leave. In Hays, Kans., all annual leave has been canceled. It is impossible to begin to tell of all instances where men are compelled to carry their own mail route and part of another one.

Question. What's your answer to these problems?

Answer. The postal service needs more manpower, particularly the appointment of full-time career employees to a greater extent. Equipment and management techniques were supposed to improve service, reduce manpower. But frankly, they looked better in the show window than they have worked inside the store. ABCD (same day business delivery) has delayed as much or more mail than it expedited. It has turned out to be a mere gimmick. Much more has been expected from the ZIP code than it can produce. The program depends upon a machine, the "optical scanner," which has not even been completely invented—and when invented will have many shortcomings. The main trouble is that the Post Office Department has been laying off people in anticipation of automation before the automated machines have arrived.

What Is Conservatism? Who Is a Conservative?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DURWARD G. HALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit today a treatise in semantics. I know not the author, but in this day when the leftist liberals claim to be moderates, and the moderates to be conservatives with complete outlawing of true conservatives, by root derivation and definition, it would do all of our colleagues well to reread this definition as set forth:

WHAT IS CONSERVATISM? WHO IS A CONSERVATIVE?

Conservatism—derived from the root word "conserve," meaning to save, protect, guard, and maintain and insure for the future.

Hence, "conservationists" of nature and natural resources are accepted as vigilant guardians of forest preserves, animal life, water, and soil and are respected for their stand.

A conservative is concerned with the conservation of spiritual and legal resources

found in our Declaration of Independence and established in the constitutional system of the United States of America. He believes principles are eternal and hence do not all necessarily need changing.

Thus a conservative is one who:

Recognizes and acknowledges the power, authority, and providence of Almighty God the bestower of human liberty.

Practices personal responsibility as a counterpart of his personal liberty, and understands that this provides the ultimate support for our system of government.

Dedicates himself to the conservation of the Constitution of the United States, in order to insure limited constitutional government and national independence.

Defends and encourages personal privacy and the right to own and operate private property, which he fully knows to be the only source of all public revenue for the operation of Government.

These are the basic tenets and principles which unite all conservatives, in spirit and moral law, regardless of creed, color, race, sex, or political party affiliation.

DR Dominican Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following excellent editorial appearing in the May 5, 1965, issue of the Peoria Journal Star written by Charles L. Dancey:

DOMINICAN ECONOMY THREAD THIN

(By C. L. Dancey)

A few months ago, when I was just checked into El Emajador Hotel at Santo Domingo, I went up to my room in the evening and found the washbowl filled with water, the glass on the little shelf filled with water, and the bathtub filled with water.

I said to myself, "Somebody is trying to tell me something."

What it meant, of course, was that the water supply of the finest modern facility in the country was not reliable, and it was a standing custom to "be prepared."

This is a hint of how that little country has been hanging by a thread, and how the snapping of that thread is more than political, more than economic, and threatens the very life of the population in basic terms of having water to drink, food to eat, and a minimum level of protection from epidemics.

President Johnson wasn't exaggerating a bit when he indicated the need for sizable forces and great deal of effort to provide the simple basic services of modern civilization if we are to keep the population alive under conditions that have disrupted such services.

These conditions have also been a clue to how vulnerable that place has been to ruthless Communist efforts at destruction. They did not need the strength to take over anything. All that was needed was the opportunity and the training to disrupt a level of development that was hanging on the edge of the cliff at best.

The consequences would automatically be massive disaster for tens of thousands, and the kind of shattering health and survival conditions that strip a people naked and defenseless before any hard-core authority trained and prepared to emerge.

The political situation was similar. Thirty years of the iron dictatorship of Trujillo, who wouldn't tolerate the existence of

May 12, 1965

more cars is not the answer. Almost all official thinking (and planning) on the subject has shifted very markedly from highways to public surface transportation in grappling with today's and tomorrow's mass movement problems.

We should be unwilling, financially and esthetically, to permit Vienna's inundation by highway traffic. If we mean to do more than repeatedly recite our chronic litany—preserve Vienna's scenic and sociological character and cater to aging toddler population—then I insist we must at least consider a way to make it easier, safer and more attractive to get from one place to another. Transportation is almost as necessary as food and I submit that the time has come for us to regard it as such.

I mean to pursue this proposal as far as I can. I present it to the council for your serious deliberation and to give it as broad a currency as possible. I would like to see it an issue in the coming council election campaign. I would like to hear it debated extensively. I may be wrong about the tactic, I'm convinced I am not about the strategy. And I need your help—we all do.

Forgive my ineloquence and thank you for your time and attention.

more to me and to many others who knew him at Murray than anyone else.

Hortin, now director of the School of Journalism at Ohio University, Athens, was a genuine newspaperman who took his sharp professional training right into the classroom and never, never let it get mossed over with the unreality of a secluded college campus.

Hortin brought with him the actuality of reporting, and of the city room, and even the presses. He introduced us, with all the realism in the world, to the editor's desk and the characters which paraded through his newsroom, and who, like lingering ghosts, parade through ours now.

As I said, Hortin was nervous. But his nervousness was energy; his inability to stand still was enthusiasm.

Many young men and women who went through his classes gained and kept unusual interest in the news business.

Among them were Ed Freeman, now managing editor of the Nashville Tennessean; Gene Grahari, a Pulitzer Prize winner for reporting; John Mack Carter, editor, Ladies' Home Journal; Burgess Scott, Ford Times roving editor; Jack Anderson, telegraph editor of the Mayfield Messenger; Ray Mofield, head of a new communications department at Murray College; Herbert Lee Williams, head of the journalism department at Memphis State, and many others who have been successful in the newspaper business and in other fields. Pogue was one of Hortin's boys. So were Lt. Gov. Harry Lee Waterfield and U.S. Representative ROBERT A. EVERETT, of Tennessee. So were Wayne Freeman and Wayland Rayburn, and Frank Ellis and Henry Whitlow, and Joe Freeland.

The remarkable thing is that Hortin can reel off a list of 50 or 60 such people without consulting a note and without stopping very long to think.

"I'm reluctant to start naming my boys and girls of yesteryear, however," he told me. "I'm sure I would leave off someone, and I don't want to do that."

He said he was a typical absentminded professor, but I know better than that, of course.

The reason for his statement was that I had written to Hortin and asked him to list for me, if he could, the standout boys and girls he had in his classes.

Back came a letter and a long list, but Hortin asked that he be given time to write to Murray State and obtain a correct list.

That is like him; he taught us very early not to guess, but to strike quickly at the best source.

But those he remembered make an impressive list; I don't believe any teacher in Murray State's history drew around him so many people who really were on their way to success.

"Please don't say much about me," Hortin said in his letter. "It is the students of mine who deserve the notice."

You don't have to say much about Hortin—just that he is one of the rarities of the journalism colleges. He is a professional who could do well in any newsroom at any time because, in the long years and the buzz of amateurs around his thronelike desk, he has not lost touch with good reporting and editing and the other realities of newspapering.

Wherever Murray Staters gather—especially those who have wound up in the newsroom, as I have and as Jack Anderson and Ed Freeman and many others have—the name of Mr. Hortin soon comes up.

We speak of him with awe. Graying men and women who are old hands in their own right do this.

The slight, quick-speaking professor has stayed with us. We never seem to alter our perspective—with Hortin being in the head chair and us listening and looking on as he talked like a Gatlin gun and nervously toyed with a blank sheet of paper on his desk.

Actually, not one of us was Hortin's favorite student. His favorite was Miss Mellie Scott of Heath. She still is. Mellie is Mrs. Hortin.

I wish we could have a reunion with Hortin sometime this summer at Kentucky Lake.

I believe we could have a big thing and that it would do all of us good to be together again.

If you're interested in a reunion, please let me know.

The Indians of Idaho—Poems by Phillip William George

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the history of our Nation and of my State of Idaho is bound up in the proud history and traditions of the American Indian.

Phillip William George, a member of the great Nez Perce Nation, of Lapwai, Idaho, has captured in magnificent poetry, the lonely and lost splendor in which his people lived and the love they held for their lands.

Mr. George is presently attending the Institute of American Indian Arts, in Santa Fe, N. Mex. He plans to major in anthropology, with an eventual teaching career in Indian history.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two of Phillip George's outstanding poetic works, entitled "Battle Won Is Lost" and "Proviso." Both of them were published in a special book which was presented to the Secretary of the Interior, in conjunction of the American Indian Festival Pageant.

There being no objection, the poems were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BATTLE WON IS LOST

They said, "You are no longer a lad."

I nodded.

They said, "Enter the council lodge."

I sat.

They said, "Our lands are at stake."

I scowled.

They said, "We are at war."

I hated.

They said, "Prepare red war symbols."

I painted.

They said, "Count coups."

I scalped.

They said, "You'll see friends die."

I cringed.

They said, "Desperate warriors fight best."

I charged.

They said, "Some will be wounded."

I bled.

They said, "To die is glorious."

I lied.

PROVISO

After my wake, oh people of my lodge,

Place a drum upon my chest

And lay me on a travois—

An ancient, gentle travois.

In the dawn, not eventide, I beg,

Take me far away.

I'll drum.

I'll sing.

May 12, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A2335

competent or independent men, stripped the country of any political development or of the development of potential political leaders, or of any truly political experience.

When Juan Bosch was elected in their first free elections, he tried to play both ends against the middle to some extent. He launched a program for "social justice" and was hailed in this country as a fine, liberal, democratic leader.

But he was blind to the nature, character, and menace of Castroite communism, it seemed.

He had not learned politics either stripped of the dictatorial experience, and he was rapidly forging a one-party liberal regime that increasingly employed the methods of oppression to build its power and permanence.

He seemed to be using union mobs to take vengeance and assist in the repression of any who disagreed with him and his program, and he made appeals of the nature that could be used with equal effect by the Communists.

As we pointed out some years ago, the military chiefs of all Latin American countries now realize that they are the first to be executed when the Communists take over, and Castro's ruthlessness in Cuba even against those military leaders who were on his side has impressed all such in Latin America and makes them sensitive and alert to developments that may lead to their own execution.

Bosch's increasingly erratic conduct. His promises and appeals. His centralization of power. All these things caused increasing fear among the military chiefs and many others involved in trying to make the primitive economy function and develop that he was intentionally or blindly setting the stage for a Castro takeover.

They finally kicked him out in desperation.

A military junta took over, but they were chiefly concerned with having a functioning state, and did not desire to run its civil life. They summoned Donald Reid Cabral, a slightly built youngish man, an auto dealer, and a man who had been on an economic mission for Bosch overseas at the time of the coup. They asked him to head up a civil government and try to put the country on its feet.

This unassuming young man apparently had nothing to do with the revolution itself and his talents were simply called upon because of the urgent need of some administrative talent.

He restored a press freedom that didn't exist under liberal, democratic Juan Bosch with the blessing of the military chiefs (although they were the chief targets of free press criticism).

They were trying to make Dominica a livable, organized part of society, after it had been under an iron heel in abject poverty for a generation, and this was a staggering task in a poor country.

Because there had been a military putsch against the democratic president, our own country dragged its feet on the normal economic aid which Dominican Republic needed more desperately than almost anybody else as a simple matter of human necessity.

This didn't help matters.

Just when we were beginning to move to give real assistance and perhaps because of that—because of the threat that it might succeed and it was now or never—Bosch's folks launched their revolution.

As the military chiefs had originally feared, Bosch's forces, his followers, and his program was so infiltrated by Communists that when Bosch, himself, tried to bring about a ceasefire, it became clear that he wasn't running the revolution any longer.

It was, indeed, in the hands of the Communists.

Their allies are ignorance, poverty, disorganization, disease, and fear. And these will be our most stubborn foes.

The Reds were obviously, and are now, perfectly willing to snap the thread of life for Dominica, to permit those island people to go down to death and desolation by starvation, thirst, epidemic disease, and then take over the shattered remnants by traditional terror tactics.

It is this that we have moved to prevent.

The biggest problem is not a military confrontation with these specialists in disorder and destruction. The biggest problem is putting together enough of the functional fabric of a society to permit people to live, to eat, and to escape mass death by epidemic disease.

That is a big job.

And it must be done—or we hand Fidel Castro, free of charge, a weapon he can use over and over again throughout the Americas.

that their behavior is illegal and considered immoral.

The typical narcotics addict requires \$10 to \$30 daily for drugs. Male addicts usually turn to stealing in one form or another to obtain the necessary money. Since stolen merchandise brings the thief only a small proportion of its original cost, addicts must steal items worth far more than the cash they need for drugs. It can be safely said that the typical male addict may steal in a year's time merchandise valued at from \$30,000 to \$90,000. The figure of \$350 million has been suggested by the Federal Bureau of Narcotics as the amount spent annually for illegal drugs.

The typical female addict usually resorts to prostitution to obtain the money she needs. It is likely that more than half the women in the prisons of our large cities are both prostitutes and narcotics addicts.

It is clear that society is paying an exorbitant price, in a variety of ways, for continuing to let this problem go unsolved.

THREE PHASES OF ADDICTION

True addiction occurs only with sedative drugs and is associated with the continued use of barbiturates and opiates. Addiction has three separate but related phases: tolerance, habituation, and physical dependence. Tolerance is the diminishing effect of the same dose of a drug, or the need to increase the size of the dose in order to get an effect similar to the earlier ones. Habituation is the emotional or psychological need which is met by the drug. Dependence is the body's need to get the drug.

Opiates that have been used by addicts in the United States are opium, morphine, heroin, and the synthetic drugs that are man-made but have an effect similar to that of an opium derivative. In the early 1930's, opium ceased to be the drug of choice among American addicts, giving way to morphine. A few years later heroin, a morphine derivative, became their preferred drug. Heroin is nearly twice as powerful as morphine and is used by most of today's opiate addicts. Heroin is illegal in the United States, and anyone possessing it is violating the law, for either the heroin itself, or the opium from which it is made, must have been smuggled into the country.

THE SPEED BALL KICK

Although not an addicting drug, cocaine is habituating and is used by some opiate addicts. It gives an almost instantaneous "charge" which is very concentrated and intense but of short duration. It stimulates, whereas opiates depress. Addicts seldom use cocaine by itself consistently because it is extremely high priced on the illegal market and because its effects are so short lived. Some experienced addicts like to mix heroin and cocaine into a "speed ball" which combines the immediate "kick" of cocaine with the extended afterglow of heroin. Addicts also call this mixture a love affair, because heroin is often referred to as "boy" and cocaine as "girl."

Other drugs which are under Federal regulation, even though they are not opiates and not addicting, are marihuana and peyote. They, too, are stimulants—not depressants.

The barbiturates, or sleeping pills, are regarded as genuinely addicting drugs when used to excess. Evidence gathered in the past few years strongly suggests that overuse of barbiturates may lead to an addiction as serious, if not more so, than the opiates. Some narcotic users, take barbiturates if their regular drug is not available, and some take both opiates and barbiturates.

Many people still believe that an addict can be identified by his appearance. He cannot. As a matter of fact, members of an addict's immediate family may not observe any changes in his appearance due to his use of drugs. It is true, however, that heroin

¹ Condensed from the forthcoming book, "Today's Health Guide." Copyright 1965 by the American Medical Association. To be published in June 1965.

A2336

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 12, 1965

users may have scars or sores on their arms resulting from repeated injections of the drug into the veins.

It is extremely difficult to recognize an opiate user who is receiving a regular supply of his drug. If the drug is withdrawn for 1 or 2 days, however, the addict is easily identified by a series of definite involuntary reactions called the withdrawal or abstinence syndrome. The severity of the addiction can be measured by the severity of this reaction pattern. A mild abstinence syndrome involves sneezing, yawning, perspiring, watering of the eyes, and a running nose. A moderate response includes tremors of the body, goose flesh, loss of appetite, and dilation of the pupils.

A severe syndrome often involves fever, increased blood pressure, rapid breathing, insomnia, and acute restlessness. In its most intense form, the response takes the form of vomiting, diarrhea, weight loss, and spasms of the limbs. The reaction pattern begins when the effect of the last shot starts to wear off. For the typical heroin addict, this period is nearly 6 hours; for the morphine addict, it is likely to be 12 hours; for the opium addict, 24 hours.

The sociologist sees addiction as a problem that develops in certain geographical areas, in specific environments. He equates addiction with economic depression, cultural deprivation, and a high rate of juvenile delinquency. The psychologist, on the other hand, interprets addiction among minority groups as an expression of frustration and hostility. The psychoanalyst sees the addict developing in and responding to a specific kind of family situation.

Many people hold fast to the idea of addiction being strictly a problem of law enforcement. They feel that if the smuggling rings are smashed and the pushers thrown in jail, addiction will disappear because no illegal drugs will be available.

Another group holds the opposite view. They insist that addiction is an illness and that law enforcement cannot cure an illness. They point out that prohibition did not eliminate alcoholism. Drug use, they point out, is a symptom of other serious problems, and any treatment for addiction must take these problems into consideration.

This group also argues that making addiction a crime may actually increase the number of addicts. Because drugs are illegal, they are expensive; because much money can be made from their sale, the underworld and the "pushers" try to make as many addicts as possible. This group points to the low number of addicts in Great Britain. There addicts may register with the police, without penalty, and receive drugs at low cost while undergoing medical treatment.

A NEW INTEREST

Formidable barriers stand in the way of progress in the narcotics addiction field, but the situation is far from hopeless. As this is written, there is a new stirring of interest in the drug problem; there is encouraging action on a number of fronts, there are many hopeful signs.

Several State probation and parole departments have been testing the usefulness of intensive casework by parole officers to help the addict make a satisfactory adjustment.

A number of church-sponsored groups have pioneered in providing services to support addicts trying to break their drug habit. A few voluntary agencies are developing experimental casework services tailored to the needs of the addict struggling with the problem of readjustment.

The mass media have been focusing the public's attention on the narcotics problem.

Narcotics Anonymous, patterned after Alcoholics Anonymous, was founded in 1949 by Daniel Carlson, a former addict. It now has branches in a number of cities and is gaining experience in providing effective re-

sources for addicts. NA accepts only members who are off drugs and offers the ex-addict the chance to discuss his problems with others facing similar difficulties.

While addiction can be treated successfully in some instances, it is a long and hard fight, and relapses are common. It cannot be emphasized too often or too earnestly that the only way to be safe against drug addiction is to avoid any practice that might lead to it. Trying marijuana just for kicks often leads to heroin addiction. Glue sniffing by adolescents, using airplane model glue, can lead to serious physical results, and the effects it produces may cause a desire for bigger and stronger "kicks." Other dangerous drugs include peyote (mescaline), Mexican mushroom, Jimson weed, and LSD-25. These drugs are known as hallucinogens; they create a temporary illusion of well-being, but their ultimate effect is trouble.

WARN YOUNG PEOPLE

Another form of drug use which leads to habituation rather than addiction is the use of stimulants or pep pills, such as amphetamine, often used by students and others who wish to keep awake under difficult conditions. Often sleeping pills are alternated with stimulants, creating first artificial sedation and then stimulation, an undesirable substitute for normal rest and sleep.

While drug addiction has been decreasing in the United States, it remains a serious problem in areas where minority groups are numerous, and where social and economic conditions are unfavorable. Young people should be warned in a factual, unemotional, but emphatic manner of the dangers involved in trying a drug "kick" just once.

The only safe way to use any kind of drugs, except possibly a few common household remedies, is under medical supervision.

Thirtieth Anniversary of the Rural Electrification Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OFHON. BERT BANDSTRA
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, for many farm families across the Nation, including those in my home State of Iowa, this week marks an anniversary of very special importance.

Thirty years ago this week, on May 11, 1935, President Franklin Roosevelt signed the Executive order establishing the Rural Electrification Administration. A year later, with the passage of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, the Congress gave its support to this constructive venture.

Today, the REA is a permanent agency of the Federal Government. It has done much, over the 30 years of its existence, to bring the benefits of electric power to farm houses throughout America.

In Iowa, for example, only 14.4 percent of the farms were receiving electric service when the REA was created in 1935. As of June 30, 1964, 98.7 percent of Iowa's farms were served by electric power.

The REA, and those who have supported it, can justly claim the credit for much of this increase in rural electric service—an increase which, in the long run, benefits both urban and rural areas of our society.

Much remains to be done in developing the resources of rural America. There are new problems to be solved, and new programs must be devised to do so. But the REA, with 30 years of success behind it, is an example that provides us with confidence.

Potential for a National Park: The Guadalupe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OFHON. JOE R. POOL
OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 12, 1965

MR. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues a very fine piece of writing which appeared in the January 1965 issue of American Motorist. This article very aptly points out the need and reasons for establishment of Guadalupe Mountains National Park in west Texas:

POTENTIAL FOR A NATIONAL PARK—THE GUADALUPE

(By Glenn T. Lashley, editor, American Motorist)

The land west of the Pecos is a country that seems desolate, yet abounds in incredible beauty and soul-satisfying tranquility. The land, in west Texas and eastern New Mexico, is literally a paradise for the man and his family who must live in the city for economic reasons, but feel compelled to turn to the outdoors for its spiritual lift.

There is a tremendous need for the preservation of such areas. Congress established the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission to survey the outdoor recreation needs of the American people, and to recommend actions to meet them. The Commission has reported that the gap between the demand and an adequate supply of outdoor facilities will widen over the coming years, if effective action is not taken, and promptly.

Commission research reveals that by the turn of this century our population, which is going to double, will have triple the present outdoor recreation needs. Not only will there be more people, but they will have more free time, more money, and a greater mobility, than ever before.

Congressman Joe Pool, of Texas, is very much concerned about this trend, and plans to reintroduce a bill in the House of Representatives this session which would establish the Guadalupe Mountains National Park in west Texas. He submitted the bill during the last session of Congress, but it was never brought out to the floor for action. Before submitting, Congressman Pool had called for an investigation of the area by the Interior Department to determine its value as a national park.

Interior Secretary Stewart Udall ordered such a study and, when the results were in, enthusiastically urged Congress to enact the legislation. He said:

"The area set aside for the park contains a combination of scenic and scientific attributes that qualify it as an outstanding addition to the national park system. It contains the most diversified and beautiful scenery in Texas, some of the most beautiful landscape in the entire southwestern part of the United States, and its Permian marine limestone mountains contain the most extensive and significant fossil reefs in the world."